

THE HERMENEUTICS AND TRANSLATION STYLISTICS  
OF THE SEPTUAGINTAL BOOKS OF HAGGAI AND MALACHI

BY

R. WILLIAM DICKSON

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH



1990

To the extent that it is ever true of an intellectual product, this work is entirely my own. Of course my acknowledgments and my notes indicate the extent of my dependence on others.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2. HEBREW <i>VORLAGE</i> OF THE LXX OF THE MINOR PROPHETS	8
<i>Kethib/Qere</i>	
<i>Sebirin</i>	
<i>Tiggun Sopherim</i>	
<u>The Variants Found or Implied in the Dead Sea Scrolls</u>	
<u>Murabba'at</u>	
<u>The Damascus Document</u>	
<u>The Pesharim</u>	
<u>Conclusion</u>	
3. COMMENTARY: ΑΓΓΑΙΟΣ . . . . .	40
<u>Chapter 1</u>	
<u>Chapter 2</u>	
4. COMMENTARY: ΜΑΛΑΧΙΑΣ. . . . .	111
<u>Chapter 1</u>	
<u>Chapter 2</u>	
<u>Chapter 3</u>	
<u>Chapter 4</u>	
5. CONCLUSION . . . . .	212
Works Consulted . . . . .	237

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with great pleasure that I should like to express my gratitude to all those persons who have helped me in the progress of my work. Clearly my greatest debt of gratitude is to my supervisor Dr. A. G. Auld. Without his constant encouragement, rigorous yet constructive criticism and generous bibliographic and technical assistance, this study would have been impossible. Professor J. C. L. Gibson directed an invaluable seminar in the Dead Sea Scrolls and offered numerous very helpful suggestions concerning this work. Dr. A. P. Hayman kindly worked with me in Aramaic and offered much guidance in my study of Second Temple Judaism.

I also benefitted greatly from the members of the department of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology. The Advanced Greek Reading Seminar was of inestimable value to me. It was wonderful to translate many Hellenistic Jewish texts in such expert company.

I must mention several friends who made the stresses of doctoral research less burdensome. Terry, Jim, John, Larry and Jane know how refreshing our times at the Castle Arms were, yet thanks are in order. My Greek class at St. Thomas's Episcopal Church was a delight to direct.

And of course this study would not have been possible without the loving support of my family. I particularly thank my parents and my mother-in-law Shirley Phillips, who were very supportive. Few could imagine the debt which I owe Gene Phillips, and it was a terrible blow to me and my family that we should lose him during the course of this project. My children were very big-hearted and permitted me to read more than any father should. My wife was a constant help and encouragement. Indeed, she was my inspiration. Surely the lion's share of sacrifices for this undertaking was borne by my loving wife.

## ABSTRACT

This study undertakes to demonstrate and assess the essentially hermeneutical nature of the differences between the MT and the LXX of the books of Haggai and Malachi.

In Chapter 1 I introduce the study and explain that virtually all of the past major treatments of the LXX of the Minor Prophets were essentially atomistic in nature and made no effort to treat the Greek text as a coherent, unified literary and theological work with its own independent integrity. I argue that the nature of the LXX of these books and the function of the LXX in history both constitute compelling reasons to treat the text as something other than a more or less defective witness toward a reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage* which might be useful in the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament.

In Chapter 2 I undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the *Kethib/Qere* variants, the *Sebirin*, the *Tiqqune Sopherim* and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region as these might bear upon the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets. I conclude that there is no evidence of systematic conformity to a proto-septuagintal text-type and that the textual evidence suggests a stream-like history with a constant intermixing of texts.

In Chapters 3 and 4 I provide a detailed textual commentary on Haggai and Malachi. In this commentary, I typically address the relation of the LXX's *Vorlage* to the MT, the meaning of the *Vorlage*, the meaning of the MT, the translator's understanding of the meaning of his *Vorlage*, the reasons the translator translated as he did and the significance of his Greek language without any concern for the motives or confusion which might be behind the Greek.

In Chapter 5 I conclude the study with an argument that the LXX of the Minor Prophets illustrates that an ancient translation could be both highly literal and yet reflect a high degree of hermeneutical intentionality by the translator. This possibility certainly complicates the matter of assessing the literalness of ancient translations. Furthermore, I offer an assessment of some of the central hermeneutical principles which influenced the translator in his re-shaping of the biblical text. I also argue that this study constitutes further evidence that much of the ancient interpretation of the Old Testament and many of the ancient versions of that text regularly employed palaeographically tendentious citation or translation and that a widespread program of paronomasia such as is in evidence in the LXX of the Minor Prophets can utterly confound text-criticism if incautiously defined.

To Doni

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

### How This Study Came About.

This study is the result of a lengthy and complicated evolution. For initially, my examination of the Septuagint of the books of Haggai and Malachi was merely what might be regarded as text-critical preliminaries toward the real study which was intended to be a careful analysis of the Hebrew text of the books in question with certain particular interests in the matters of the compositional history and eschatology of the books. But I found myself unable to leave the "preliminary" study behind. I found the issues of the Greek text to be so complicated and so fascinating that it was impossible for me to shift my focus from that text.

What I initially observed was that in spite of the very impressive and prodigious creativity of many fine scholars who had made almost innumerable suggestions about how the differences between the MT and the LXX should be regarded as the result of differences between the *Vorlage* of the LXX and the MT, when the suggested differing *Vorlage* was examined closely, it was usually anything but convincing. Typically, upon investigation the proposed *Vorlage* was discovered to be contrary to expected Hebrew idiom and to imply a Greek rendering at odds with the standard renderings found in the Minor Prophets. And of course there was that problem of understanding how a text which needed as much alteration as implied in the sea of proposed emendations could have even been comprehensible, much less relatively smooth and straight forward.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, the more I looked at the differences between LXX and MT, the more the differences looked other than random or isolated. They had

the appearance of forming a substantially coherent structure of thought. In fact, early in my examination of the books I began to suspect that I was coming to know a little something about the translator and his own thinking. This came as quite a shock. I had never before imagined that such an encounter might occur. My previous training and experience in the LXX had inclined me toward the view that the books of the LXX were more or less defective witnesses to be used in the reconstruction of an ancient form of the Hebrew Old Testament which might on occasion be quite useful in correcting the MT where it had experienced corruption of one sort or another. But early in my analysis of the books I perceived that such a high percentage of the differences between LXX and MT appeared to represent the intentional alterations made by the translator, that it would be necessary to modify my previous view of the textual relations between the LXX and MT. I undertook the study of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi expecting to alter slightly my general text-critical predisposition. I could have never imagined the extent of the challenge to my general view of textual realities which I would ultimately encounter in the LXX of the Minor Prophets.

### The Need for the Study.

There have been quite a number of substantial text-critical tomes on the LXX of the Minor Prophets in recent scholarly history. And I have profited greatly from them. They are, in order of publication:

Vollers, K. A. Das Dodekapropheton Der Alexandriner: Erste Hälfte: Naûm, Ambakûm, Sophonias, Angaios, Zacharias, Malachias. Berlin: Mayer and Mueller, 1880.

Stekhoven, J. Z. Schuurmans De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1887.

Wellhausen, J. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, Fünftes Heft: Die Kleinen Propheten Übersetzt, Mit Noten. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892.

Kaminka, Armand. Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher. Frankfurt A. M.: J. Kauffman Verlag, 1928.

Ziegler, Joseph.<sup>2</sup> "Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheton." Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Philolog.-Hist. Klasse 1943, 345-412.

Dingermann, Friedrich. "Massora-Septuaginta der kleinen Propheten: Eine textkritische Studie." Inaugural diss., Würzburg, 1948.

Of course there are also a great many lesser works, many of which are quite important. But the substantial treatments of the LXX of the Minor Prophets are the works mentioned. I have particularly profited from Stekhoven and Dingermann. My dependence on their work will be clear throughout. But what is clearly the case about all of these works is that none of them makes any pretense of treating the Greek text as a coherent literary work. None of these works could be regarded as an exegesis of the Greek text. This is the primary need which I seek to address in this study. Any help which might be gleaned along the way with respect to the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament would of course be valued, yet it is my central purpose to elucidate the Greek text itself.

Of course the detailed exegesis of a work in translation, particularly when a text closely related to the translation's *Vorlage* is extant, deserves some defense. One aspect of that defense is the issue of how the translation functioned in history. In this case, clearly the translation was treated as a distinct literary work with its own theological integrity. So Claude Cox states,

The LXX as a collection of Scripture circulated in Egypt, Palestine, and beyond; Philo and Josephus use and comment upon it; early Christian writers like Paul quote from it liberally in New Testament writings. To cite only one relevant example of such quotation, it is LXX Job to whom James refers when he says to his readers, "You have heard of the steadfastness (hypomone) of Job." (5:11).<sup>3</sup>

This is true and important. And yet, the most fundamental defense of the idea of doing exegesis on the LXX itself is a proper view of its nature. And to elaborate on that subject at this point would be premature. Thus we shall suspend the completion of the justification of our approach until the conclusion, at which point we can draw upon the detailed treatment of the subject matter to inform our view about such a fundamental question as the essential nature of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi.

### The Approach of the Study.

We must arrive at some general opinion about the probabilities that the differences between the LXX and MT correspond to the LXX's connection with a putative proto-septuagintal text-type. Toward this end, in Chapter 2 we will do a comprehensive evaluation of the *Kethib/Qere* variants, the *Sebirin*, the *Tiqqune Sopherim* and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region. Furthermore, we will assess the relative significance of the LXX's agreement with any Hebrew texts which differ from the MT and address the question of whether or not there is evidence of systematic conformity to a proto-septuagintal text-type.

Chapters 3 and 4 certainly constitute the heart of the study. This is our detailed textual commentary on Haggai and Malachi. In this commentary, we will typically address the relation of the LXX's *Vorlage* to the MT, the meaning of the *Vorlage*, the meaning of the MT, the translator's understanding of the meaning of his *Vorlage*, the reasons the translator translated as he did and the significance of his Greek text as read by readers only interested in the most natural meanings of the Greek language without any concern for the motives or confusion which might be behind the Greek. Clearly this exegetical work is multi-faceted. Nevertheless, it will always be the case that our central orientation to



the text will be the Greek of the books under investigation.

We will conclude our study in chapter 5 with a consideration of some of the central hermeneutical principles which influence the translator in his re-shaping of the biblical text. And finally we will discuss his essential *modus operandi*. In this final chapter, we will conclude our defense of the legitimacy and importance of the inquiry.

<sup>1</sup>Verhoef's statement on the matter is sound. He states, "My fifteen-year experience in Bible translation has strengthened the conviction that the majority of proposed alterations to the text (cf., e.g., BHK/5) are really unnecessary. This conclusion also applies to the text of Haggai (and Malachi). Mitchell's list of additions, omissions, and errors, for example, is impressive, but most of the items are arbitrary (e.g., in 1:2,3,4,6,9,10,11,12,15; 2:2,5,7,15-16, 17,18,19,22,23). In the commentary we have pointed out that the "defectiveness" of the text need not be interpreted as corruption, but rather as the result--as Harrison puts it--of "stylistic clumsiness." In most cases the meaning of the text is clear.

Pieter A. Verhoef, The Books of Haggai and Malachi. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Joseph Ziegler is the editor of the Göttingen edition of the Minor Prophets, Duodecim prophetae. 3rd ed. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Vol 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984. Unless otherwise specified, this edition is used as representing the closest approximation to the Old Greek of the Minor Prophets. Outside the Minor Prophets, unless otherwise specified, we will be using Rahlfs's handy text. I will on occasion question some of Ziegler's text-critical decisions, nevertheless, in general we are on a sure footing with his text. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the difficulties attendant to creating an eclectic text which purports to represent the Old Greek (LXX) from the various LXX manuscripts. However, I am aware that if the ancient scribes exercised a very high degree of authorial intentionality in their copying of their texts, then it necessarily follows that attempts to reconstruct the Old Greek by genealogical stemmata will be to some extent confounded. I have pointed out several instances of such tendentious alterations by the scribes.

This study would not have been possible without virtually unlimited access to the Ibycus computer of New College, Edinburgh. Particularly extensive use was made of the Packard Humanities Institute CD Rom #1 (particularly the CCAT Biblical Materials from the University of Pennsylvania). Dr. David Mealand of New College, Edinburgh, the resident

Ibycus expert, was particularly helpful and generous with his time.

<sup>3</sup>Claude Cox, "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job" in the IV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986, ed. Claude E. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), p. 79. Compare Takamitsu Muraoka's discussion in "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute 9, 1983, pp. 24-5.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX of the Minor Prophets

All septuagintal study must be pursued with a constant awareness of the very real possibility that the Greek translation represents a translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage* quite different from the present MT. In determining the relative probability that the *Vorlage* might have indeed been different from the MT there are two principal approaches to the question. First is the consideration of the evidence of the existence of real Hebrew variants. Second is the assessment of the general character of the translation and the likeliness that any differences between the LXX and the MT are best understood as attributable to the translation process. Although clearly these two considerations are quite closely related to one another, inasmuch as we will give careful consideration to the matter of translation technique throughout the textual commentary, at this point we will only consider the evidence which might suggest the existence of real Hebrew variants. We will consider the evidence of ancient textual plurality at the level of the Hebrew text by means of a comprehensive examination of the *Kethib/Qere* variants, the *Sebirin*, the *Tiqqune Sopherim* and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Kethib/Qere*

##### Hosea

4.6 K וְאִמְאֵסָךְ Q וְאִמְאֵסָךְ "According to Olshausen (*Heb. Gram.* p. 179),

the anomalous form **וּאִמְאִסְךָ** is only a copyist's error for **וּאִמְאִסְךָ** ; but Ewald (§247, *e*) regards it as an Aramaean pausal form."<sup>2</sup> The suggestion in BHS that the K might be a corruption from an original **וּאִמְאִסְךָ אֲנִי** (LXX = καγω απωσομαι σε) is very unconvincing. Rather, the Greek looks to be a rather unexceptional assimilation toward the precise wording of the second half of the verse--και επελαθου νομον θεου σου, καγω επιλησομαι τεκνων σου. It should be noted that the word-order of the Hebrew of the second clause (where the emphatic personal pronoun does in fact occur) is not such that would correspond closely to the "original" *Vorlage* of the LXX suggested in BHS--**וּתְשַׁכַּח תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשַׁכַּח בְּנִיךָ גַם־אֲנִי**.

6.10 K **וְשַׁעֲרֵי־יְהוּדָה** Q **וְשַׁעֲרֵי־יְהוּדָה** This is one of 20 instances where the K has the nominal pattern based on the Aramaic Pa'il form while the Q has the form derived from the Qal Passive--Pa'ul.<sup>3</sup> The LXX has a predictable rendering--εν τω οικω Ισραηλ ειδον φρικωδη.

8.12 K **אֲכַתּוּב** Q **אֲכַתּוּב** The Qere simply indicates that a vowel reduction would be expected in view of the shift of the accent which is occasioned by the makkeph (לֹ).<sup>4</sup>

**רַבִּי Q רַבּוֹ K** In this instance, there are two different words at stake. The K represents a variant form of the word **רַבּוֹ**, which means "myriad or numberless" while the Q represents the plural construct of the word **רַב**, which means "multitude or abundance." The editors of BHS wrongly commend the suggestion of Wellhausen to read the text as

תורתו רב.<sup>5</sup> The Greek of the LXX is καταγραφω αυτω πληθος και τα νομιμα αυτου. If the final ך of the unpointed *Varlage* of the LXX were misread as the conjunction, then surely there would be no reason to imagine anything other than the K reading. But as Gelston notes, the readings of Symmachus and the Peshitta support the Q. Symmachus has εγραψα αυτω πληθη νομων μου.

9.16 K בלי Q כל These negatives are so similar in usage that it would be very unlikely that any difference could be perceived in translation. (Cf. GKC §152 t).

10.10 K עינתם Q עונותם The Q reading of "their iniquities" is supported by the LXX (εν ταις δυσιν αδικiais αυτων), the Vulgate, the Targums and the Peshitta. It is difficult to imagine what the K might mean and the absence of the dual form in reference to two eyes is quite unexpected.<sup>6</sup>

11.8 K כצבאים Q כצבאים LXX has ως Σεβωιμ Gordis explains, "The orthography of גיים and צביים with two Yods, or the spelling צבאים, makes an error easily possible, which the Q seeks to prevent by writing the more normal and hence less equivocal form on the margin."<sup>7</sup>

13.2 K כלו Q כלו As Gordis states, "To avert the possibility of their being read Kames He, i. e., as feminine suffixes, the Q writes the later and clearer form, with Vav, on the margin, as a guide to the reader in the absence of vocalization."<sup>8</sup> The LXX has συντετελεσμενα which has every appearance of being a mistranslation of the K.

## Joel

4.1 K אָשׁוּב Q אָשׁוּב LXX επιστρέψω The Greek verb renders both the Qal and the Hiphil of אָשׁוּב so often that there is no possibility of determining which Hebrew form was in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. What is no doubt behind the Q is the fact that there is no clear-cut example of אָשׁוּב as a Qal transitive except in the expression which occurs here--אֶת־שָׁבוֹת.<sup>9</sup> KB (pp. 953-4) even speculates that there are two roots behind the Hebrew אָשׁוּב, and that the second one only occurs in the phrase in question. This seems a bit unlikely. William L. Holladay offers a fine survey of suggested explanations of the clause.<sup>10</sup>

## Amos

8.4 K לַעֲנִי Q לַעֲנִי Plural constructs of עָנִי and עָנִי respectively. No clear difference in meaning or of renderings in the LXX.

8.8 K וְנִשְׁקָה Q וְנִשְׁקָה The forms are the 3FS Niphal Perfect of שָׁקַח and שָׁקַח respectively. The LXX has καταβησεται which follows the Q. That K is corrupt is clearly suggested in the parallelism of 9.5 where one finds the expected form וְנִשְׁקָה. Symmachus evidently reads the Q with his καταδυσεται. Theodotion might read the K with his more vivid καταποντισθησεται. [Note that καταποντιζω often renders בָּלַע (Pi. "to drink") in the LXX.]

9.6 K מַעֲלוֹתָיו Q מַעֲלוֹתָיו This is a common case of the Q wanting to ensure that the expected ' associated with personal suffixes connected to nouns in the plural is not deleted. Its omission is very common.<sup>11</sup> The

LXX has ἀναβασιν αὐτοῦ. Symmachus has τὰ ὑπερῶα αὐτοῦ. It is precarious with Gordis to imagine that the LXX is misreading the Q because of its singular ἀναβασιν.

### Obadiah

11 K שְׁעָרָיו Q שְׁעָרָיו The LXX has πύλας αὐτοῦ. The K can either represent the singular noun or the plural written defectively. See GKC §91 &. However, it is certainly impossible to imagine that the rendering of the LXX proves that its *Vorlage* had the plural form. Both the Hebrew word שְׁעָר and the Greek word πύλη are collective singulars. Thus in the MP alone, one observes that שְׁעָר occurs 12 times and that only in the Q of Obadiah 11 and in Zech. 8.16 is the Hebrew word plural. Yet the Greek rendering of the word is typically plural (singular only in Mi. 1.9; 2.13; Zeph. 1.10; & Zech. 14.10). And it is perhaps noteworthy that שְׁעָר occurs in Ob. 13 in the singular where it is predictably rendered with a Greek plural.

### Micah

1.3 K בְּמֹתֵי Q בְּמֹתֵי K is plene.

1.8 K שִׁלֵּל Q שׁוֹלֵל Variant spelling of same word.<sup>12</sup>

1.10 K הִתְפַּלְשְׁתִּי Q הִתְפַּלְשִׁי The first person sing. Perfect of the K makes absolutely no sense in the context. It is necessary with LXX, P and Vulgate to read with the imperative. But the person of the imperative needs to be plural. The history of the obvious corruption was תִּי » י » ו<sup>13</sup>



3.2 K רעה Q רע LXX τα πονηρα The LXX renders both Hebrew words with the Greek word.

### Nahum

1.3 K וגדל Q וגדל The Q merely preserves the anticipated reduction in view of the following Makkeph מִכֶּכֶּה.

2.1 K לעבור־בך Q לעבור־בך Same as 1.3.

K כלו Q כלו The LXX has συντελεσται which is an obvious mistranslation of the K. Compare Hosea 13.2.

2.6 K בהליכותם Q בהליכותם LXX has εν τη πορεία αυτων (Q). Alexandrinus represents the K with its plural ταις πορειαις.

3.3 K יבשלוֹ Q וכשלוֹ LXX και ασθενησουσιν Because the Greek word regularly renders the Hebrew verb both in the Qal and in the Niphal, there is really no way to know what the *Varlage* of the LXX was. The future tense of the Greek does not prove that it was translating the K for the Perfect + ו might be in grammatical sequence with the first verb of the paragraph יבש (in verse 1) and thus might derive its temporal force from this Imperfect.

### Habakkuk

1.9 K כלו Q כלו LXX mistranslates the K with συντελεια. Symmachus renders the Q with παντα.

1.15 K כלה Q כלו LXX mistranslates the K with συντελειαν.

3.4 K לצה Q לצו Once again simply a difference in the form of the 3MS suffix. Cf. Hos. 13.2.

3.14 K פריו Q פריו LXX has δυναστων. Inasmuch as the K merely represents the defective writing of the suffix on a plural noun, there is no way of knowing what the *Vorlage* of the LXX was.

### Zephaniah

2.7 K שבותם Q שבתם A simple non-semantic phonological difference. As Gordis observes, "When a 'u' form of the verb is used, the Q has an i form of the noun שבתני. In other words, the Q, but not the K, manifests a distaste for two i sounds or u sounds in succession."<sup>14</sup>

### Haggai

1.8 K ואכבד Q ואכבכה The cohortative final ה is at stake. The reading of the LXX και ευδοκησω could of course represent either Hebrew reading.

### Zechariah

1.4 K ומעלילים Q ומעללים It is very difficult to know how to point either form. The K form is not known elsewhere. It likely represents an early scribal error of assimilation toward the well-known form עלילה. If that be correct then it is not unlikely that we also have the scribal error of haplography at work. Thus the history of the forms would be:

ומעלילים » ומעללים » ומעלילים. The LXX has και απο των επιτηδευματων υμων των πονηρων. It is precarious with Gordis to

speculate on the *Vorlage* of the LXX at this point. The frequency with which the LXX uses επιζηδεύμα to render both עלילה and מעלל is such that there is no possibility of determining the *Vorlage* here. Neither is the και απο adequate proof that the *Vorlage* had a double מ. If the form only had one מ then the double-duty of the מ of מְדַרְכֵיכֶם הָרָעִים would quite naturally be inferred by the translator.

1.16 K וקוה Q וקן LXX has και μετρον. KQ represent different forms of the same word.

2.8 K אלו Q אליו

4.2 K ויאמר Q ויאמר LXX has και ειπα. Alexandrinus has και ειπεν. The difficult (impossible ?) reading of the K is surely the result of a scribe accidentally looking back to the preceding ויאמר at the beginning of the verse. The Q is supported by manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza, the Latin Vulgate, the Targums and the Syriac Peshitta.

11.2 K הפצור Q הפציר Pa'ul or Pa'il?

11.5 K ואעשר Q ועשר The Q is impossible. The LXX has και πεπλουτηκαμεν. This 1st person plural verb might suggest a *Vorlage* of ננעשר

14.2 K תשגלנה Q תשכבנה The K is the Niphal of שגל and means "the women will be ravished." The Q is the Niphal of שכב (Qal--to lie down)

and is simply a euphemism for the same. See Gordis p. 86 for a complete list of KQ variants based on this motive of guiding the reader to avoid reading something too coarse or obscene. The LXX has *αι γυναικες μολυνθησονται*. There is no other instance where the LXX renders either *לגל* or *שכב* with this Greek word. So it is possible that the translators have created a euphemism of their own. There is no reason to imagine that the *Vorlage* was anything other than the K.

14.6 K *יִקְפְּאוֹן* Q *יִקְפְּאוֹן* The K is the Qal Imperf. of *קפא* and means to congeal or thicken. The Q is simply the noun meaning frost. The LXX with its *και ψυχη και παγος* is very difficult. It is tempting to read instead *ψυχος και παγος*. However, the manuscript evidence and difficulty of the reading are overwhelmingly impressive. *ψυχη* (or *-ης*) is supported by W', B, S\*, V\*, Q\*, 198, 233', 393\*, 534', 544, 919, the Sahidic Version and the reading of Basilus Neopatrensis. The reading of the LXX might constitute support for the Q if only because it has a noun.

### Sibirin<sup>15</sup>

#### Hosea

4.8 K *נִפְשׁוּ* S *נִפְשָׁם* LXX *τας ψυχας αυτων* It is not uncommon in Hebrew for the singular pronominal suffix to refer distributively to a plural. If that were the case with *נִפְשׁוּ* then the LXX might have simply smoothed out the language toward reasonable Greek idiom. However, it is also fairly likely that there occurred an ancient scribal error of dittography. The sequence of readings thus would have been *נִפְשׁוּ הֵיךָ* » *נִפְשׁוּ הֵיךָ*<sup>16</sup>

7.12 K כֹּאֲשֶׁר S אֲשֶׁר LXX καθως (?) See BDB p. 83 (\*8e).

9.2 K בָּהֶם S בָּם LXX αυτοις (S)

12.9 K וַיֹּאמְרוּ S וַיֹּאמֶר LXX και ειπεν (K--although the collective noun אֶפְרַיִם/Ephraim can easily take a plural verb.)

### Amos

5.19 K מִפִּי S מִפִּי LXX εκ προσωπου (K)

9.9 K אֶרֶץ S אֶרֶצָה LXX επι την γην (?)

### Jonah

1.14 K כֹּאֲשֶׁר S אֲשֶׁר LXX ον τροπον (?)

### Micah

7.12 K יְבוֹא S יְבוֹאוּ LXX constitutes a substantial rereading of the passage. Whereas the Hebrew is וְעַד־יָבֹאוּ (ו) [and unto you it (they) shall come], the Greek και αι πολεις σου ηξουσιν is reading the text as though it were וְעַד־יָבֹאוּ. Thus the plural verb cannot be decisive in determining the *Vorlage* since it is required by the explicitly plural subject. The subject of the Hebrew is indeterminate.

### Haggai

1.12 K כֹּאֲשֶׁר S אֲשֶׁר LXX καθοτι (?)

Zechariah

6.7 K וַיֹּאמֶר S וַיֹּאמְרוּ LXX και ειπε (K)

10.7 K וְהָיוּ S וְהָיָה LXX και εσονται (K ? Cf. Hos. 12.9. )

14.8 K יִהְיֶה S יִהְיוּ LXX ---(?)

Tiggune SopherimHosea

4.7 פְּכוּרֵי ... הַמִּירֹו is held to be a correction of אֲמִיר ... כְּבוֹדִם. The LXX has την δοξαν αυτων εις ατιμιαν θησομαι, clearly agreeing with MT.

Habakkuk

1.12 קְדָשִׁי לֹא תִמּוֹת is held to be a correction of קְדָשִׁי לֹא נִמּוֹת. The LXX has και ου μη αποθανωμεν, supporting the MT.

Zechariah

2.12 נִגַע פִּכְכַת עֵינַי is held to be a correction of נִגַע פִּכְכַת עֵינָיו. The LXX has απομενος της κορης του οφθαλμου αυτου, agreeing with MT.

Malachi

1.13 וְהִפַּחְתֶּם אֹתוֹ is held to be a correction of וְהִפַּחְתֶּם אֹתֵי. The LXX has και εξεφυσησατε αυτα. The reading supports the MT for the plural αυτα is simply the result of the fact that the antecedent is ταυτα.

## The Variants Found or Implied in the Dead Sea Scrolls

There are three principal ways in which the texts discovered in the region of the Dead Sea might be of interest in our assessment of variants within the Hebrew tradition of the Minor Prophets. First is the important Hebrew scroll of the Minor Prophets discovered in a cave of Wadi Murabba'at (M88).<sup>17</sup> Second are the citations from the MP in the Damascus Document. And finally and most important are the Pesharim of the books within the collection. We shall examine every instance where the LXX might be in agreement with manuscripts from the Dead Sea region against the MT. Then we shall assess the magnitude and significance of the agreement in view of the overall number of variants.<sup>18</sup>

### Murabba'at

Obadiah 17 MT מורשיהם M88 מורישיהם LXX τους κατακληρονομησαντας αυτους The MT represents the plural (+ suffix) form of the noun מורש ("possession"). M88 represents the Hiphil participle ("those possessing"). The only other occurrence of the Hebrew word is in Isa. 14.23 למורש קפד / ωστε κατοικειν εχινους The renderings of the closely related feminine noun מורשה are:

Ex. 6.8 ενκληρω

Deut. 33.4 κληρονομιαν

Ezek. 11.15 εις κληρονομιαν

25.4 εις κληρονομιαν

25.10 εις κληρονομιαν

33.24 εις κατασχεσιν

36.2 εις κατασχεσιν

36.3 εις κατασχεσιν

36.5 εις κατασχεσιν

While it does seem that the translator of Ezekiel and Deuteronomy know

the feminine word מורשה, it is not clear that the masculine מורש was known. Furthermore, it is worth noticing that the Hiphil of ירש occurs 60+ times and yet is rendered with the Greek κατακληρονομω only one time (Judg. 11.24). The only other occurrence of the Hiphil of ירש in the MP is in Zech. 9.4 where the Greek is κληρονομησιν. In these circumstances, it is very difficult to speculate on the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

Micah 2: 11 MT לו איש M88 לא איש LXX ουδενος (=M88) Although the LXX read the word as לא, the word of the MT can either be spelled לו or לא so that the reading of the LXX only reflects a judgment about the vocalisation.

Nahum 1: 5 MT הרים M88 ההרים LXX τα ορη (=M88 ?)

Zephaniah 3: 15 MT איבך M88 איבך LXX εχθρων σου (=M88 ?)

### The Damascus Document

1.13-14 (Hos. 4.16) MT כי כפרה סרה סרר ישראל

CD כי כפרה סרה בן סרר ישראל

LXX οτι ως θαμάλις παροιστρωσα παροιστρησεν Ισραηλ (=MT)

19.15-16 (Hos. 5.10) MT היו שרי יהודה במסיגי גבול עליהם אשפוך כמים

The היו שרי יהודה במשיגי גבול עליהם אשפך כמים עברה CD עברתי

confusion between ש and ס is common and not noteworthy. The LXX with its το σπλημα μου does reflect the pronominal suffix of MT's עברתי.



16.15 (Mi. 7.2) MT אִישׁ אֶת־אֲחִיהוּ CD אִישׁ אֶת רֵעִיהוּ LXX εκαστος τον πλησιον αυτου (=CD) Although πλησιον does seem to render the Hebrew אֶת in Gen. 26.31, Lev. 25.14, and Deut. 19.19, elsewhere in the MP it renders לְ. One could perhaps suspect that CD and LXX were assimilating toward 7.5 where the MT is אֶל־תֹּאמִינוּ בָרַע, however at this point LXX has μη καταπιστευετε εν φιλοις.

9.5 (Na. 1.2) MT נִקֵּם יְהוָה לְצָרָיו וְנוֹטֵר הוּא לְאֹיְבָיו  
 CD נִקֵּם הוּא לְצָרָיו וְנוֹטֵר הוּא לְאֹיְבָיו

LXX εκδικων κυριος τους υπεναντιους αυτου και εξαιρων αυτος τους εχθρους αυτου (=MT)

19.7-9 (Zech. 13.7) MT נָאם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת CD נָאם אֵל LXX λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ (=MT)

6.13-14 (Mal. 1.10) MT מִי גַם־בָּכֶם יִסְגֹּר דְּלֹתַיִם וְלֹא־תֹאִירוּ מִזִּבְחֵי חֲנָם  
 CD מִי בָכֶם יִסְגֹּר דְּלֹתַי וְלֹא תֹאִירוּ מִזִּבְחֵי חֲנָם

LXX διوتي και εν υμιν συγκλεισθησονται θυραι, και ουκ αναψετε το θυσιαστηριον μου δωρεαν Because the translator has altered the rhetorical force of the first clause, it is impossible to speculate about the presence or absence of the גַּם or conjunction; however it is quite likely that his *Varlage* did not have the pronominal suffix of דְּלֹתַי.

## The Pesharim

### Hosea

2.11 MT לכסות 4Q166 מלכסות LXX του μη καλυπτειν There is syntactical ambiguity in the function of the ל. The MT surely means "I will snatch away my wool and my flax *given* to cover her nakedness." In this construction the purpose clause is dependent on the assumed *given*. The text of 4Q166 and the LXX find the purpose clause to follow directly from the verb והצלתי (I will snatch away . . . in order to or with the result that . . .). When read this way the Greek negative or the privative מן is required for the proper sense. Cf. BDB p. 583 #7 b (ø) and GKC §119 y.

2.13 MT וכל מועדה 4Q166 וכל מועדיה LXX και πασας τας πανηγυρεις αυτης The MT is surely a distributive singular. Thus the fact that the LXX with πανηγυρεις is plural is not the slightest evidence of real textual correspondence between the reading of 4Q166 and LXX.

6.9 MT ובחכי 4Q163 כיחכה LXX και η ισχυς σου The MT represents the Piel infinitive construct of חכה (See GKC §75 øø). 4Q163 has the imperfect of the same verb. Vegas Montaner argues that the reading of the LXX suggests an original *Vorlage* of ובוחכה. This suggestion has the merits of: 1. Acknowledging the typical rendering of ισχυς for כֹּחַ, and 2. Explaining the σου as a rendering of the pronominal suffix כה. However, it is subject to criticism inasmuch as 4Q163 lacks the conjunction. The reconstruction requires a confusion of ו for י. It requires the plene form of the ו (a spelling which only occurs 1 time in the MT--Dan. 11.6) and of the suffix. And it implies a Hebrew text which was unintelligible. For it is surely difficult to imagine how וכוּחַכָּךְ אֶתְּחַזֵּק could be translated. Thus, it is quite precarious to associate the LXX and 4Q163 at this point.

Amos 1:3 MT --- 5Q4 (ת)הרו LXX τας εν γαστρι εχουσας A shared plus like this certainly looks like an instance of genealogical relation between texts. However, assimilation toward verse 13 (הרות הגלעד/τας εν γαστρι εχουσας των Γαλααδιτων) is not at all unlikely.

Micah 1:3 MT ארץ ארץ 1Q14 (ץ)האר LXX της γης Vegas Montaner assesses the situation very nicely:

En Profetas Menores *gē* aparece sin artículo cuando sigue un sustantivo. En posición final, como aquí, lo normal es la presencia del artículo, pero está también atestiguado simplemente *gēs* (Hab 2,8.17; Zac 9,10, lo que daría fuerza a esta variante. Sin embargo, adviértase que la expresión *hm(w)ly rs* (Dt 32,13; Is 58,14; Am 4,13; Miq 1,3) nunca lleva artículo y, no obstante, en los cuatro casos G traduce *tēs gēs*, lo que indudablemente convierte el apoyo de G a Q aquí en prácticamente irrelevante.<sup>19</sup>

### Nahum

2.14 MT רכבה 4Q169 (רובכה) LXX πληθος σου The MT reads, "I will burn her chariots (רכבה--collective singular). Virtually the whole line is missing from 4Q169 so that one finds the hypothetical reconstruction ה[רובכה] As clearly stated in a note on p. 41 the word רובכה is "reconstructed from the *peser* in l. 10." The Targums read "your chariots" [although Sperber's Ms c has "its ("her") chariot(s)"].<sup>20</sup> Gelston is probably correct in his view that the Peshitta's agreement with LXX should probably be regarded as dependence.<sup>21</sup>

3.1 MT ימיש 4Q169 ימוש LXX ψηλαφηθησεται The MT represents the

Hiphil of one root מוֹשׁ, while 4Q169 (and the rendering of LXX) represent the Qal of a second root מוֹשׁ. The passive of the Greek likely represents merely a bit of smoothing by the translator.

3.8 MT חיל 4Q169 חילה LXX ης η αραχη (+ αυτης-- W<sup>o</sup> A' and Theodoret)

3.8 MT מים 4Q169 ומים LXX και υδωρ (=ומים) The Greek conjunction in

and of itself could never be substantial proof of the existence of the conjunction in its *Vorlage*. The real difference pertains strictly to the pointing of מים.

3.11 MT תהי 4Q169 ותהי LXX και εση

### Habakkuk

1.4 MT משפט 1QpH המשפט LXX το κριμα

1.5 MT כגוים 1QpH [כוגדים] LXX οι καταφρονηται It is very likely that the *Vorlage* of the LXX was כוגדים. Cf. 2.5 וְאֵף כִּי־הֵיִין בְּגֹד / ο δε κατοινωμενος [κατοιομενος] και καταφρονητης

1.8 MT יבאו 1QpH --- LXX σπησουσιν This is probably just a free rendering of יבאו.

1.15 MT יגרהו 1QpH נִיגְרָהוּ LXX και ειλκυσεν αυτον

2.2 MT קורא 1QpH לקורא LXX αναγιγνωσκων

2.5 MT היין 1QpH הון LXX Ziegler accepts the conjecture of Rahlfs that κατοιομενος (the conceited one) should be read instead as κατοινωμενος (the drunken one). Brownlee, on the other hand, commends the suggestion of Houtsma that the reading of 1QpH might be reflected in the κατοιομενος which is so widely supported in the Greek manuscripts. As he states, "The noun would be either *hawwan* or *hayyan*, in either case a noun of the *qattal* form like *qannā'* or *dayyan*."<sup>22</sup> In 1885 Houtsma argued that the Greek κατοιομενος derived "from the verbal root הון or היין, which appears as a *hapax legomenon* in Deut. 1:41." [ותהינו לעלת] However, it must be noted that the verbal form in question is --ההרה] generally judged to derive from an Arabic root meaning "to be light." Cf. BDB p. 223 and KB p. 228.<sup>23</sup>

2.5 MT כוגד 1QpH יכגוד LXX και καταφρονητης It is possible that the Greek reading results from a misreading of 1QpH as וכגוד.

2.6 MT משל עליו 1QpH משל עליו LXX παραβολην κατ αυτου

2.6 MT ויאמר 1QpH ויומרו LXX και ερουσιν The MT refers to the collective singular of verse 5 while 1QpH and LXX probably represent an attempt to smooth out the text so that the verb reflects the plural of the subject אלה. However, it should be noted that the LXX is perhaps understandable if the final } of the MT

2.9 MT כצע 1QpH הכוצע LXX ο πλεονεκτων

2.16 MT והערל 1QpH והרעל LXX και διασαλευθητι It appears that the MT has undergone an accidental metathesis (a suggestion made long ago by David Kimchi). The reading of 1QpH is superior on internal and external grounds. The context with its mention of drinking and drunkenness surely supports the word "stagger." Cf. the cognate noun in Zech. 12.2

(סִף־דִּעַל--"cup of staggering"). Furthermore, the reading is supported by the Peshitta, Aquila and the Vulgate. However, it must be noted that the Peshier on the verse appears to imply a knowledge of the reading of the MT. ["Interpreted, this concerns the Priest whose ignominy was greater than his glory. For he did not circumcise the foreskin [עור־לֵת] of his heart, and he walked in the ways of drunkenness that he might quench his thirst." transl. of Vermes] See Horgan p. 50.

2.17 MT יחיתן 1QpH יחתן ?/ וחתן ? LXX πτοησει σε

In plate LX column 12, there is difficulty in determining whether the first letter is י or י'. The column begins <sup>12</sup>אדם <sup>8</sup>וחם <sup>1</sup>יחיתן, and clearly the first letter is the same length as the twelfth and yet distinctly shorter than the eighth. Since the eighth letter must be a י' rather than י, it is very difficult to decide with certainty on the first letter. In the transcription found in The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary (The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven 1950), it is transcribed by Brownlee with the י'. However, Talmon and others have preferred to read it as a י'.<sup>24</sup> The LXX is perhaps understandable if the final י of the MT

were read as a ך »(יחתך) and if the ך has slipped into the word at some point later than the *Variante* of the LXX. But it would certainly be precarious to try to correlate the Greek with either Hebrew. The Hebrew is too uncertain.

2.19 MT אִמֵּר 1QpH [הא]מֵּר LXX ο λεγων Vegas Montaner's

presentation of 1QpH is quite bold here. The dot under the א implies that it is possible to make it out, yet with difficulty. In fact, the vast majority of the ה is missing and only a tiny point of the next letter is visible. Thus Brownlee transcribed the text [ ]ה. It is possible that the proposed restoration is too short.<sup>25</sup> The Greek definite article might well be expected merely on stylistic grounds.

## Conclusion

### Kethib/Qere

That the LXX of the Minor Prophets sometimes demonstrates a correlation with (perhaps dependence on) a textual tradition which differs from the K of the MT cannot be doubted. But neither should the statistical significance of this correlation be exaggerated. Of the 36 Kethib/Qere differences in the MP, in only four instances (Hos. 10.10, Amos 8.8, Na. 2.6 and Zech. 4.2) is it likely that the LXX reflects a clear correlation with the Q against the K. This represents a mere 11.11% correlation. It is possible, although unlikely, that there is a similar correlation between LXX and Q in Mi. 1.10 and Zech. 14.6. If that correlation be granted, one would have the greatest conceivable correlation of 16.66%. While it is true that a great many of these K/Q

variants are such that the Greek would not be different if the *Variage* were one form or the other, there is some probability that in such ambiguous instances the LXX should be regarded as reflecting the K of MT. This probability derives from the fact that in Hos. 13.2, Na. 2.1, Hab. 1.9 and Hab. 1.15 the LXX demonstrates through its mistranslation an unambiguous dependence on K against Q.

### Sebirin

The situation with respect to the *Sebirin* is very similar. At the very most, it might be argued that the LXX corresponds to the *Sebirin* in 3 out of 13 instances (Ho. 4.8, Ho. 9.2 and Mi. 7.12). This represents a 23.08% correlation. However, this is very misleading. For it is very likely that the LXX does not in a single instance represent true genealogical dependence on the *Sebirin*. This is true because in Ho. 4.8 it is simply a matter of a distributive singular being rendered by a plural. In Ho. 9.2 a collective singular is rendered by the plural. And in Mi. 7.12 the plural verb of the Greek is necessitated by an obvious misreading of the preceding word ועדיך as ועריך (αἱ πόλεις σου).

### Murabba'at

Of the four variants attested by M88 which might be regarded as corresponding to the reading of the LXX, we found only one which in any way looked as though it would suggest that there might be a genealogical relation. This is Mi. 2.11. The Greek οὐδενος must reflect a text like that of M88 לאִישׁ. But inasmuch as the Hebrew word found in the MT can either be spelled לו or לא, it is very probable that the ancient text had the *plene* form לא which was simply vocalized differently by the



translator of MP. The article of Nahum 1.5 might easily have been added by the translator and the plural of Zeph. 3.15 is a predictable rendering of a distributive singular.<sup>26</sup>

### The Damascus Document

The Damascus Document includes six citations from the MP. In only one of these (Mi. 7.2) does the LXX correspond to the variant of the CD. And it is quite possible that both CD and LXX are assimilating toward Mi. 7.5 where one does find the word לע.

### The Pesharim

Because of the quantity of variant readings attested either directly or indirectly by the Pesharim, we have examined only those instances where the scrolls and the Septuagint might be regarded as reflecting a common variant reading from the MT.<sup>27</sup> Without a doubt, several of the passages represent substantial and suggestive correlations between the Pesharim and LXX. These passages are of great interest and great importance. And yet it is also true that a number of these passages are variant in rather uninteresting ways (word order, presence of an article, presence of a conjunction, plural or distributive singular). In such circumstances it is precarious to imagine any genealogical relation between the Pesharim and LXX. But whatever one might decide about the probabilities of genealogical relation in any given passage mentioned, the overall impression which the data makes is very clear. Vegas Montaner's conclusion of the matter is sound. As he states:

Aunque queda fuera del ámbito de este trabajo, diremos de pasada que, salvo en pasajes muy concretos (por ejemplo, Nah 3,8; Hab 2,5-6 --en menor grado--), *no hemos detectado que el texto de Q siga a G contra H de forma nítida y sistemática*. Nos encontramos más bien con lecturas aisladas en este sentido. Aunque es necesario un estudio

más profundo, *ella nos indica que la clara distinción propugnada entre textos protomasoréticos y protoseptuagintales en Qumrán no parece confirmarse en Profetas Menores. Quizá sea más acorde con la realidad considerar la existencia de una gran fluctuación textual, con frecuentes intercambios entre los textos que después quedarían sancionados por los rabinos y aquellos que atestiguan la Vorlage de G.* Más que un corte nítido entre ambas tradiciones, unas tendencias acusadas en uno u otro sentido.<sup>28</sup> (Italics mine.)

Vegas Montaner has rather eloquently questioned the adequacy of the local text-type theory with respect to the evidence which pertains to the Minor Prophets. While it would be unsound to extend his critique to the whole of the Hebrew Bible, it is certainly fair to note that his conclusions are in close agreement with what is being concluded by several prominent scrolls experts about other areas of the Hebrew Bible. There seems to be an ever-widening consensus among the scholars of the scrolls that the highly schematic view of the evidence implicit in the local text-type theory is fundamentally inadequate. Emanuel Tov offers a more general critique of that theory in his important article entitled "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism." He states:

The greatest surprise of the Qumran discoveries derives from texts not particularly close to any of the three sources mentioned, MT, LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, but maintaining an independent status. Such texts may contain many agreements with MT, but at the same time they also significantly disagree with that source. The same applies to their relation with the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch. More importantly, they hold a significant number of readings not shared with the three sources. They are thus independent. This was realized only recently, when it was recognized that the textual variety in Qumran can no longer be described according to the pattern of the tripartite division of the textual witnesses customary before 1947. According to the old-fashioned concepts with which most scholars still work, all the Qumran texts can somehow be fitted into that tripartite picture of the MT, LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch in the case of the Pentateuch and under a different name in the other books of the Bible. However, it has now been recognized that several texts do not

fit within any such framework, and must consequently be taken as sources *additional* to those known before.<sup>29</sup>

But beyond claiming that many of the scrolls must be regarded as independent, Tov also claims that a number of scrolls which have been described by earlier scholars as conforming to this or that text-type in fact do not.<sup>30</sup> And he objects to the fundamental logic of the theory. As he states:

This variety is usually described in terms of proximity to texts known before the Qumran discoveries. This way of describing the Qumran texts is a mere convention derived from the accident that for several centuries scholars knew the mediaeval copies of MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX, but no earlier texts. *Because of this somewhat unusual situation, the data are usually delineated in reverse order, so to speak.*<sup>31</sup> (Italics mine.)

The significance of Tov's point can hardly be exaggerated. For as Kurt Aland states with reference to a similar problem in New Testament text-criticism, "The affinities of early manuscripts should not be described in terms of later manuscripts, but rather the reverse (a father does not inherit his son's traits, but a son his father's)."<sup>32</sup> Thus it is surely sound to concur with Fishbane concerning the present state of knowledge of the relevance of the scrolls to the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament. He concludes:

The complexity of these materials do not lend themselves to neat groupings of text families corresponding to such later text-types as 'Masoretic', 'Samaritan', and 'Septuagint'. There are, too [*s/c*] be sure, observable correspondences between these types and the Qumran evidence; but the multiple alignments make any final categorization premature at this stage.<sup>33</sup>

And it is probably best with Vegas Montaner to view the general textual situation as one of a "gran fluctuación textual, con frecuentes intercambios entre los textos." And such a picture of the dynamic movement of the tradition and the constant intermixing of texts renders

any type of formal genealogical reconstruction futile. For as Zuntz stated,

The reason for the modern hesitations with regard even to *recensio* is in those troublesome facts with which Griesbach had already wrestled. The modern term for them is 'contamination'. The classical method of *recensio* groups the evidence and works back from its recent to its most ancient forms by the observation of common errors. This method is strictly applicable where the tradition is split into definitely separated lines of descent. Where these lines are blurred by cross-influences, *recensio* in the technical sense of the word becomes impossible, for it cannot, *ex hypothesi*, confidently be decided whether common errors are due to the interaction between various branches or to common descent.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>1</sup>We will not consider the variants within the medieval manuscripts collected by Benjamin Kennicott or J. B. de Rossi. The opinion of E. F. C. Rosenmüller in regards to Kennicott's collection is rather standard wisdom now: "This whole congeries of variants, assembled at such an expense of time and money, leads only to one simple conclusion: that all the extant codices are very late in relation to the original . . . that they contain a wealth of scribal errors but a dearth of significant and useful readings, and that correspondingly little if any help may be anticipated from them for the corrupted passages in the Hebrew text." (*Handbuch der Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese* 1, 1797, p. 247) cited by Ernst Würthwein in *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*, 4th ed. trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ., 1979), p. 39 f.n. 69. A modern confirmation of Rosenmüller's judgment is to be found in the monumental article of Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Biblica* 48 (1967), pp. 243-90. J. A. Sanders in his brilliant survey article, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98/1 (1979), pp. 5-29 assesses the importance of Goshen-Gottstein's article in this way, "In 1967 Goshen-Gottstein published a pivotal study in which he argued that the medieval manuscripts collated by Kennicott and de Rossi, and so often cited by text critics to support textual emendations, were essentially derivative of the massoretic tradition, often times reflecting late ancient and medieval midrashic interpretations of scripture, and had little value for reconstructing pre-massoretic text forms. The challenge of Goshen-Gottstein's essay was directed at the very concept of text criticism as understood in biblical criticism until recently."

<sup>2</sup>C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament: Vol. 10, Minor Prophets*, trans. James Martin, (n.d.) reprint (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1982), p. 78.

<sup>3</sup>See esp. pp. 117-119 of Robert Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of Kethib-Qere*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1971) and GKC §§4a, 8, 9, & 12.

<sup>4</sup>Gordis, pp. 113-114.

<sup>5</sup>So Leslie Allen in *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1976), p. 276, f.n.

<sup>5</sup>J. Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, Fünftes Heft: Die Kleinen Propheten Übersetzt, Mit Noten, (Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1892), p. 119.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. especially Zech. 5: 6 & 8 זָאָת הָרָשָׁעָה / זָאָת עֵינָם Surely Wilhelm Rudolph is correct to state, "Richtig ist nur LXX (ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν) und P («Schulden») = עֵלָם; auch Hieronymus, obwohl er bei M bleibt, stellt fest, wie leicht ך and ך verwechselt werden kann." Haggai; Sacharja 1-8; Sacharja 9-14; Maleachai, Kommentar zum alten Testament, band XIII.4 (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976), p. 118, fn. \* 6.

<sup>7</sup>Gordis, pp. 94-5.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 92-4, cf. p. 56.

<sup>9</sup>See especially the fine treatment of William L. Holladay, The Root Sûbh in the Old Testament with Particular Reference to its Usages in Covenantal Contexts, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), pp. 114-115 §25 "Is There a Qal Transitive?" He concludes, "Our conclusion from the instances cited here is that, aside from the phrase *sûbh sebhûth*, no clear-cut example exists of a qal transitive."

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 110-114.

<sup>11</sup>See especially the note of B. Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, 1956), p. 12 (Section IV \*1). "This is most frequent in suffixes of the 3 pers. sing. masc., יִי, which is very often, and in all the copies alike, written ך, but the Keri almost always substitutes the common form יִי."

<sup>12</sup>Gordis suggests a different root. He states: "We prefer the K as a Shaphel formation of יָלַל (always פִּי"י in the meaning 'wailing'. We shall then have perfect parallelism, for each stich will express the idea of mourning: a) אִסְפָּדָה b) שִׁילָל c) מִסְפָּד d) אִבֵּל." (p. 183 f.n. \*273). However, this suggestion makes it difficult to translate the clear doublet (with apparent synonymity) of the clause אִילָבָה שִׁילָל וְעָרוֹם. And surely the stripping is a symbolic expression of mourning so that the stich in question is not lacking in the idea.

<sup>13</sup>So Leslie Allen in The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1976), p. 276, f.n.



\*53. Gordis (p. 185, f.n. 290) suspects a "precativ perfect" and commends the "illuminating" discussion of Driver. In fact, Driver concludes his discussion by saying, "But the fact is that the evidence for this signification of the pf. is so precarious, the passages adduced in proof of it admitting of a ready explanation by other means, that it will be safer to reject it altogether." S. R. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew (3rd ed., 1892), p. 25-6. GKC §106 *n* f.n. 2 states, "Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a *precativ perfect* in Hebrew."

<sup>14</sup>Gordis, p. 122.

<sup>15</sup>On the often neglected *Sebirin* see Würthwein p. 17, Gordis pp. 26-8, Israel Yeivin, Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah, trans. and ed. E. J. Revell. Masoretic Studies 5 (n.p.: Scholars Press, 1980), §109 & 110 (pp. 62-4), S. Frensdorff, The Massorah Magna, Part One: Massoretic Dictionary or The Massorah in Alphabetical Order, reprint with Prolegomenon by Gérard Weil (New York: KTAV Publ. House, Inc., 1968), pp. 369-73, and especially C. D. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, London, 1897 (reprint New York, 1966 with Prolegomenon by H. M. Orlinsky), pp. 187-196. I have used Ginsburg's handy collection of *Sebirin* which is to be found in his The Massorah Compiled from Manuscripts, Alphabetically and Lexically Arranged (London, 1881-1905) Vol 2, pp. 324-9.

<sup>16</sup>See the fine discussion in GKC §145*m* (p. 464).

<sup>17</sup>This very significant scroll is dated from the second century A.D. and came to light in 1955 (cf. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, rev. ed., 1961; reprint, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), pp. 18-19). Cross states, "The MS, found by *bedu*, purportedly comes from a fifth Murabba'ât cave perhaps a kilometer or slightly less west of the four investigated in 1952. As we shall see, the text of the Murabba'ât manuscript of the Twelve Prophets, like that of the more fragmentary biblical material, is virtually identical with the Masoretic consonantal tradition." (p. 19, f.n. \*23). The text is published as part of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II: Les Grottes de Murabba'ât par P. Benoit, O.P., J.T. Milik, et R. De Vaux, O.P. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 181-205.

<sup>18</sup>This aspect of our study is greatly helped by the comprehensive study of Luis Vegas Montaner, "Aportación al aparato crítico de la Biblia

Hebraica: relación completa de variantes de los manuscritos del Mar Muerto respecto al textus receptus de Profetas Menores" in Simposio Biblico Español (Salamanca, 1982) Ed. por N. Fernandez Marcos, J. Trebolle Barrera and J. Fernandez Vallina, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, 1984 pp. 149-181.

<sup>19</sup>Vegas Montaner, p. 172.

<sup>20</sup>Kevin J. Cathcart and Robert P. Gordon, The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes, The Aramaic Bible Vol. 14, ed. Kevin J. Cathcart, Michael Maher and Martin McNamara (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), p. 138, f.n. 45. They follow the Clementine edition of the Vulgate when they suggest the reading *quadrigas tuas*. It is perhaps better with Weber et al (*Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 1969) to read *quadrigas eius*.

<sup>21</sup>A. Gelston, The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 168.

<sup>22</sup>William H. Brownlee, The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran (Philadelphia: SBL, 1959), pp. 45-9.

<sup>23</sup>For a different view which places great weight on the rabbinic tradition and the renderings of the versions, see Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. John T. Willis, Geoffrey W. Bromiley and David E. Greene, Vol. III (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1978), pp. 364-368, article by E. Kutsch. "If we are not to assume that the versions--and Rashi--were merely guessing in their interpretation of *hwn* hiphil, we can only conclude that the root *hwn* found in Dt. 1:41b $\beta$  corresponds in meaning to the Heb. and Jewish Aram. root *zmn*. If so, the versions with their various renderings have grasped different portions of the range of meanings represented by *hwn*. Like *zmn*, then, *hwn* means 'be ready'; the hiphil means 'be ready, make oneself ready, set about.' This gives rise to the meaning 'incite each other' (Syr.), 'hasten (to do something)' (Saadia and others).

If we do not have to consider such meanings as 'be easy, be light' for the root *hwn*, the emendations suggested for Job 30:24 and Hab. 2:5 are likewise unnecessary." (p. 366).

<sup>24</sup>See Brownlee (pp. 79-81) and Maurya P. Horgan, Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly: Monograph Series, 8 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of



America, 1979), pp. 50-1 for a good survey of the debate.

<sup>25</sup>Brownlee, states on pp. 87-88:

It is uncertain what one should read at xii, 15 for MT 2:19 אָמַר Rost restores ה[אָמַר]. Elliger restores ה[אָמַר]. Habermann supposed a dittograph here, and restored ה[וִי הָאָמַר]. Elliger's restoration is orthographically better than Rost's and fills the space a bit better. Habermann's reading which does even better in filling the space had been entertained by the present writer previously. If one counts the spaces according to the line above, he finds room for six letters and a space before לַעֲזֹ (the next word). Elliger's restoration would be two spaces short. Habermann's restoration would be one letter too many, but not impossible, as one may see by calculating according to the second line above, where one more letter appears within the same space. One may also measure הוִי at the end of xii, 14, and then allow מוֹרָה of xi, 5 (with mostly the same letters) together with the preceding and following spaces to indicate the room required for אָמַר to see that this is sufficient for Habermann's restoration. One could also restore ה[אָמַרִים].

<sup>26</sup>Of course the article of Nahum 1.5 (הַהָרִים = M88 and τα ὄρη = LXX) could easily have dropped out by haplography. This accidental omission would have been extremely likely if the letters of the partial acrostic of Nah. 2-8 were actually written at the beginning of the lines of some of the ancient Hebrew manuscripts הַהָרִים » הַהָרִים.

<sup>27</sup>As we indicated earlier, this aspect of our study is dependent on the very important article by Vegas Montaner. Although our basic source is Vegas Montaner's table \* V. Mar Muerto = LXX (p. 158), we have at times supplemented his list.

<sup>28</sup>Vegas Montaner, p. 179.

<sup>29</sup>Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol XXXIX No. 1, Spring, 1988, pp. 31-2.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid. p. 19, f.n. 91. He states:

Other Hebrew texts were described as 'Septuagintal' as well, but in our view the evidence is too scanty: 2QDeut<sup>c</sup> (see DJD III [Oxford 1962] 61); 4QEx<sup>a\*</sup> (see F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies<sup>2</sup> [New York 1961] 184; R. W. Klein, Textual Criticism of the Old Testament [Philadelphia 1974] 13-15); 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>

(P. W. Skehan, *op. cit.* [n. 83]) = "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran," BASOR 136 (1954) 12-15.

Similarly in his important article "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls" [HUCA 53 (1982), pp. 11-27], he states, "I am not saying that none of the Qumran scrolls displays a close relationship with the LXX or Sam. Pent., but the greater part of the scrolls that hitherto have been described as 'Septuagintal' or proto-Samaritan' are, in fact, individualistic and independent." (pp. 20-1).

<sup>31</sup>Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts" p. 28. Similarly, Tov argued in "A Modern Textual Outlook. . ." that, "The very use of the term 'text-type' thus elevated three individual sources to the status of the main representatives of imaginary larger groups of sources." (p. 12)

<sup>32</sup>Kurt and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 58-9. The important statement in its entirety is:

The methods and terms traditionally used by textual critics to define the textual character of these fragments has tended rather to confuse than to clarify matters. Typical is the appendix to Bruce M. Metzger's The Text of the New Testament, pp. 247-256, with its "Check-list of the Greek Papyri of the New Testament." In describing p<sup>32</sup>, for example, it states: 'agrees with  $\aleph$ , also with F and G' (p. 250). What does this mean? About A.D. 200, when p<sup>32</sup> was being written,  $\aleph$  of the fourth century did not yet exist, nor yet F or G, both of the ninth century. Of p<sup>47</sup> it states: 'agrees with A, C, and  $\aleph$ ' (p. 252). Here as in so many other instances the relationships which do exist are described in reverse (for p<sup>47</sup> they are demonstrably wrong: it is allied to  $\aleph$ , but not to A or to C, which are of a different text type). Besides, the affinities of early manuscripts should not be described in terms of later manuscripts, but rather the reverse (a father does not inherit his son's traits, but a son his father's). Descriptions in such terms as 'mixed text,' 'partly Alexandrian, partly Western (pre-Caesarean) text,' etc., to describe manuscripts of a period when these groups had not yet developed and could hardly be 'mixed' contribute nothing to clear thinking.

<sup>33</sup>Jan Mulder, Harry Sysling eds. Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* Section 2, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), p. 343.

<sup>34</sup>Günther Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1946, (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 8-9. And similarly, in the important collection of Zuntz's lesser works, Opuscula Selecta, (Manchester University Press, 1972), in the article entitled "The Text of the Epistles" (pp. 252-268) Zuntz writes:

I would suggest the following qualifications of the traditional theory: (1) The term 'recension' (introduced by Semler) conveys an incorrect idea of the tradition. There was neither an Eastern nor a Western *recension*. With it the idea of a *genealogical descent* of manuscripts must go. Every manuscript, of course, has ancestors and, very often, also descendants; but we cannot identify them (except in the case of a few groups of late manuscripts). The tradition ought to be visualized, rather, as a broad stream, of which the extant manuscripts and other witnesses yield occasional, rare samples (this may seem to be no more than an irrelevant change of metaphor, but therewith it becomes possible to account for facts otherwise unaccountable). (p. 254)

He goes on to state:

It is not, as in the case of some classical authors, a matter of one, or a few, manuscripts slumbering in some remote library, rarely read and still more rarely copied. The tradition of The Book is part and parcel of the life of Christianity. It comprises all the manuscripts existing at any given moment throughout the world, with the notes and corrections added to them, the quotations drawn, the versions made from them. You try to visualize the welter of communities small and great everywhere; each of them, and many individual members, have their copies; they use, compare, exchange, copy, and gloss them; and this living process goes on for centuries--a broad stream of living tradition, changing continually and, at any one moment, wide and varied beyond imagination. And against this rather overpowering notion of what the tradition really was, you put the comparatively tiny number of old manuscripts and other surviving evidence. Is it surprising that these survivals cannot be brought into a strictly rational relation? On the contrary: it would be surprising if they could. (pp. 255-256)

Although Zuntz was addressing the issue of the text of the epistles of the New Testament, he has in my opinion described to perfection the stream-like character of the textual history of the sacred texts of both Christians and Jews.

CHAPTER THREE  
Commentary

ΑΓΓΑΙΟΣ

1 Ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ εἰσι ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ  
ἐκτῷ μίᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου ἐν χειρὶ Ἀγγαίου τοῦ  
προφήτου λέγων Εἰπον πρὸς Ζοροβαβέλ τὸν τοῦ Σαλαθιὴλ ἐκ φυλῆς  
Ιουδα καὶ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Ἰωσεδεκ τὸν ἱερεὰ τὸν μέγαν λέγων  
2 Ταῦδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ λέγων Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος λεγούσιν Οὐκ  
ἔχει ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου.

Translation: 1 In the second year of Darius the king, in the sixth month,  
on the first *day* of the month, the word of the Lord came by the hand of  
Haggai the prophet, saying, Speak to Zorobabel the son of Salathiel, from  
the tribe of Judah, and to Joshua the son of Josedek, the high priest,  
saying, 2 Thus says the Lord Almighty, saying, This people say-- The  
time to build the house of the Lord has not come.

Ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ εἰσι ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ βασιλέως  
בְּשָׁנָה שְׁנִיָּה עָלֵי דָרְיָוֹשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ

The Syro-Hexapla represents ἐν ἡμέραις (as in 2: 1,10). No preposition is  
present in 26 (Rome, 10th C.) or the Bohairic Version.<sup>1</sup> However, this use  
of ἐπὶ is very well attested. Under section I.2. (with the Genitive), BAGD  
states, "of time (Hom.+) *in the time of, under* (kings or other rulers)".<sup>2</sup>  
Mayser, commenting on the occurrence of this expression in the Egyptian  
papyri, states: "Der temporale Gebrauch von ἐπὶ τινος zur Angabe der Zeit,  
in oder während der etwas geschieht, beschränkt sich auf die Datierung  
nach Regierungsjahren der Könige bzw. nach Amtsjahren der eponymen  
Priester und Beamten. . ." He provides very many examples of the  
so-called "Königsdaten".<sup>3</sup> The same expression and rendering are found in  
2: 10,14 and in Zech. 1: 1,7 and 7: 1.

εν τω μηνι τω εκτω μια του μηνος  
בחדש הששי ביום אחד לחדש

A rigid literalism might have involved explicitly representing the word "day" and repeating the εν to represent the second Hebrew preposition. Of course the dative adequately expresses the meaning and is in fact representing the more normal Hebrew idiom. The word "day" is regularly omitted where it is quite easily understood from the context.<sup>4</sup> The usual expression occurs in 2: 1 בַּעֲשָׂרִים וְאַחַד לְחֹדֶשׁ = μια και εικαδι του μηνος and in 2: 20 בַּעֲשָׂרִים וָאַרְבַּע לְחֹדֶשׁ = τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος. The translator might have been influenced by these two passages. The other occurrence of the Hebrew temporal expression with the word "day" in this book is in 1: 15 where once again the translator leaves out the word. (בַּיּוֹם עֲשָׂרִים וָאַרְבַּע לְחֹדֶשׁ = τη τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος)

εγενετο λογος κυριου εν χειρι Αγγαιου του προφητου λεγων  
היה דבר־יהוה ביד־חגי הנביא

Thackeray notes: Hebrew is fond of what may be called *physiognomical expressions*, that is to say phrases referring to parts of the human body, ear, eye, face, hand, mouth etc.: in particular, many expressions are seldom found without some such adjunct. This accounts for a wide use of οφθαλμος, προσωπον, στομα, χειρ etc., in the LXX: many of the LXX phrases are, however, passable, if unidiomatic, Greek expressions: the Hebrew has merely given them a wider circulation.<sup>5</sup>

Moulton concurs, "We have a further set of "Hebraisms" in the compound prepositions which are freely made with προσωπον, χειρ and στομα... Even here the Semitism is still on the familiar lines: a phrase which is possible in native Greek is extended widely beyond its idiomatic limits because it translates exactly a common Hebrew locution..."<sup>6</sup>

Raija Sollamo in her very thorough study, Renderings of Hebrew



Semiprepositions in the Septuagint, distinguishes two fundamental senses in the ±430 occurrences of כַּיִד in the MT: 1) כַּיִד *loci* (which is seldom concrete and local and typically metaphorical)--±300x, and 2) כַּיִד *instrumenti* (which means "by the hand of, by, through") --±120x.<sup>7</sup>

With respect to the contemporary Koine outside the LXX she states:

In the contemporary extra-Septuagintal Koine and as early as Classical Greek many similar phrases with χεῖρ appear, such as εἰς (τας) χειρας, ἐν (ταις) χερσιν, ἐν χειρι, δια χειρων or χειρος, ὑπο χειρα, the sense being local or metaphorically local, at times even temporal (ὑπο χειρα). But these expressions with χεῖρ are not used instrumentally in earlier or contemporary 'secular' Greek.<sup>8</sup>

But BAGD lists a few possible secular uses of the idiom, one of which might well be contemporary with the later books of the LXX. "The OT (but cf. Diod. S. 3, 65, 3 ταις των γυναικων χερσι = by the women; Ael. Aristid. 45 p. 70 D.: μετα της χειρος των δικαιων; Philostrate., Vi. Apoll. 6, 29; Nicetas Eugen. 7, 165 χειρι βαρβαρων) has a tendency to speak of a person's activity as the work of his hand. . ."<sup>9</sup> The passage from Diodorus Siculus (I BC) could be considered contemporary with the translation of the later books. The passage in question reads:

ἐνιοτε γαρ τη της θειας φυσεως υπεροχη χρωμενον τιμωρεσθαι τους ασεβεις. ποτε μεν αυτοις εμβαλλοντα μανιαν, ποτε δε ταις των γυναικων χερσι ζωντας διαμελιζοντα· [For sometimes using the eminence of the divine nature, he punished the ungodly, either striking them with madness or dismembering them, while living, by the hands of (or through) the women.]<sup>10</sup>

Symmachus, not surprisingly, smooths out the Greek to the more idiomatic δι Αγγαιου.

Cyril of Alexandria, not realizing the Greek was merely a rather slavish rendering of a common Hebrew expression of instrumentality finds an emphatic reference to Haggai's ministerial service in the language:

γενεται τοιουν ο λογος εν χειρι Αγγαιου· το δε εν χειρι

νοησεις, αντι του, διαχειριζοντος. ηγουν διακονουμενου τοις παρα  
 θεου λογοις, και την της προφητειας λειτουργιαν εκπραττοντος.  
 [Moreover, the word came by the hand of Haggai--you will observe the  
 'by the hand of' in place of 'administering', which is to say ministering  
 the words from God and performing the prophetic service.]<sup>11</sup>

λεγων Ειπον προς Ζοροβαβελ τον του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα και  
 προς Ιησουν τον του Ιωσεδεκ τον ιερεα τον μεγαν λεγων  
 ...לְבַרְכֵּךְ

The participle λεγων introduces a slightly different reading from that in the MT. The Hebrew reads, "The word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet to Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and to Joshua the son of Jehozadak the high priest, saying. . ." The Greek, on the other hand, reads, "The word of the Lord came by the hand of the prophet Haggai, saying, "Speak to Zerubb. . ." One's first inclination might be to suspect a *Varlage* which differs from the MT in this section. Such a view is perhaps supported by the fact that in the Minor Prophets לְבַרְכֵּךְ is consistently rendered by the pleonastic Greek participle. (Am. 2:12; 3:1; 7:10; 8:5; Jon. 1:1; 3:1; 3:7; Mi. 3:11; Hag. 1: 2,3,13; 2:1,2,10,11,20,21). But there is some evidence that the translator of the Minor Prophets exercised a bit of liberty in the translation of direct discourse. In Hosea 6: 1 one finds the septuagintal plus, Εν θλιψει αυτων ορθριουσι προς με, λεγοντες. . . Jonah 3: 8 inserts an extra λεγοντες. Zechariah 2: 4(8) has an extra participle in לְבַרְכֵּךְ ה' = και ειπε προς αυτον λεγων. . . What one is likely observing in this verse of Haggai is probably nothing more than that rather common policy of the LXX translators to make explicit what was merely left implicit in the Hebrew text. As Wevers notes in his provocative little article, "Translation and Canonicity: A study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus": "If one is producing the word of God one would expect an attempt at accuracy much greater than for some secular work. . . This kind of pedantic exactness is often reflected when

that which is implicit in the text is rendered explicit in LXX." 12

The δῆ (which typically renders אֵל) is included in Rahlfs and is supported from A, Q, W, 49, 449, 770\*. It is however omitted from the other main textual witnesses and might represent assimilation toward that rather fixed idiom as it occurs in 1: 5; 2:2, 11, 15, and 18.

Ζοροβαβέλ τον του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα  
 זְרֹבָבֶל בֶּן־שַׁלְתִּיאל פַּתַּת יְהוּדָה

The obvious and fascinating difference between the LXX and the MT lies in the fact that in the Hebrew, Zerubbabel is referred to as "the governor of Judah" while the Greek has instead "from the tribe of Judah" (cf. 1:14; 2: 2, 21. 1: 12 has the Greek plus εκ φυλης Ιουδα.) This is a very difficult difference to assess with any certainty at all. The Greek of the LXX is what would be expected if it were a translation of מִמְּשַׁפַּח. In fact, in every occurrence of מִשַּׁפַּח in the Minor Prophets, it is apparently rendered by the Greek word φυλη ( Am. 3:1,2; Mic. 2: 3; Nah. 3:4; Zech. 12: 12,13,14; 14: 17,18). Thus one might be inclined to conclude that the LXX has simply translated a different *Vorlage*. However, if it has been shown that there is good reason to believe that the *Vorlage* of the LXX and the MT were very close to one another in general, and if we do not imagine a different Hebrew text behind the Greek of 1: 12 where one finds the Greek plus--εκ φυλης Ιουδα where the Hebrew has the unqualified זְרֹבָבֶל בֶּן־שַׁלְתִּיאל, then we might take the plus of verse 12 as a hint that the LXX translator intends some type of emphasis in his translation. A simple misreading by the translator is unlikely to have been repeated three other times. And the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew word is clear from the typical rendering of Mal. 1: 8 ηγουμενω (the only other occurrence of פָּחַח in the Minor Prophets outside of Haggai).

So it is with some considerable justification that one considers possible



motivations and intentional emphases behind the differing texts. If intentionality is involved here, there are only two likely explanations: either the translator is hesitant to refer to Zerubbabel as "the governor of Judah" or he is particularly interested to stress that he is "from the tribe of Judah." Wolff is probably correct in his judgment that "The fact that Zerubbabel came from the tribe of Judah (cf. I Chron. 2:3ff.; 3:17ff.) would seem to be more important for Gk than his official position in the Persian empire."<sup>13</sup> That interest in Zerubbabel's tribal connections is only intelligible in terms of its messianic implications. Thus, this rendering is one of several evidences that the post-exilic community (of which the LXX translators are representatives) responded to the failed prophecies concerning Zerubbabel with a profound theological courage and confidence in the sure purposes of Yahweh. Rather than minimizing the prophetic statements which we might view to be a source of embarrassment and frustration to the ancient recipient, in fact the LXX translators enhanced and accentuated the messianic language in reference to both Zerubbabel and Joshua. Von Rad is quite right to challenge the modern reader, "Is it not possible that a prediction which was defined as "visionary" at the time of its delivery afterwards became absorbed in the great complex of prophetic tradition, because like other such predictions it was applied, after the failure of its first objective, to a future act of God?"<sup>14</sup>

2 Ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ λεγων Ο λαος ουτος λεγουσιν Ουκ ηκει ο καιρος του οικοδομησαι τον οικον κυριου.

The rendering of the introductory prophetic formula **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה** is absolutely consistent in the Minor Prophets. It is always rendered **ταδε λεγει . . . ουτως ειπεν** never occurs. The only variations concern the divine title and these are also quite consistent. The occurrences of **ταδε λεγει** in the Minor Prophets are (the superscription indicates the form of

the divine title):

Am. 1: 6<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>, 13<sup>1</sup>; 2: 1<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>1</sup>; 3: 11<sup>2</sup>, 12<sup>1</sup>; 5: 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup>, 16<sup>4</sup>; 7: 11, 17<sup>1</sup>; Mi. 3: 5<sup>1</sup>; Ob. 1: 1<sup>2</sup>; Na. 1: 12<sup>1</sup>; Hg. 1: 2<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>, 6\*, 7<sup>3</sup>, 9\*\*<sup>3</sup>; 2: 7<sup>3</sup>, 12<sup>3</sup>; Za. 1: 3<sup>3</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 14<sup>3</sup>, 16<sup>1</sup>, 17<sup>3</sup>; 2: 8<sup>3</sup>; 3: 8<sup>3</sup>; 6: 12<sup>3</sup>; 7: 9<sup>3</sup>; 8: 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup>, 7<sup>3</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>, 14<sup>3</sup>, 19<sup>3</sup>, 20<sup>3</sup>, 23<sup>3</sup>; 11: 4<sup>3</sup>; Ma. 1: 4<sup>3</sup>

The rendering of divine titles is quite consistent:

1. יהוה = Kyrios; 2. אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה = Kyrios o Theos; 3. יהוה צבאות = Kyrios παντοκρατωρ; 4. יהוה אלהי צבאות = Kyrios o Theos o παντοκρατωρ

Amos 5: 3 ταδε λεγει κυριος L<sup>1</sup>,<sup>36</sup>, 86, 407, 233, 538 Bo Aeth Cyr. Th. + ὁ θεος O, 130 Hi(vld.) + κυριος (W) and Rahlfs text. The Hebrew is כִּי יְהוָה אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה Amos 7: 11 is quite unlike all the other occurrences of the phrase in the MP for the prophet is the subject of the verb. כִּי־יְהוָה אֲמַר עֲמֹם

\*Hag. 1:6 Alexandrinus has διοτι ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Most of the Greek manuscripts have no such formula at all. There is of course no comparable formula in the MT.

Interestingly, the only place where ταδε λεγει represents anything but יהוה אֲמַר is Hg. 1: 9 where the Hebrew has אֲנִי\*\*

Ουκ ηκει ο καιρος του οικοδομησαι τον οικον κυριου.  
לֹא עַתָּה עַתָּה עַתָּה בֵּית יְהוָה לְהַבְנוֹת

Winton Thomas argues that the MT is corrupt and that the first עַתָּה should either be deleted or be vocalized עַתָּה "now". He also repoints the infinitive to a perfect "has come".<sup>15</sup> BHS notes that the Peshitta agrees with the LXX in reading with a perfect. It also suggests that the ηκει supports the change to עַתָּה with the ה apocopated. Ackroyd, noting the widespread belief that the MT is corrupt, objects:

Yet the use of the root bô 'come in,' with reference to religious ceremonial (cf. e.g. Ps. 95.6) and the evidence of an almost poetic rhythm in the oracles of Haggai suggest that the excision of the phrase may destroy the full effect of the comment: 'It is neither a time for religious celebration, nor a time for rebuilding.'<sup>16</sup>

indicated by the negative construction in Hag. 1.52, indicates that the

Rudolph states, "Wörtlich: "Es ist nicht die Zeit des Kommens, die Zeit (des Hauses Jahwes, gebaut zu werden)".<sup>17</sup> This literal reading is quite correct and perhaps suggests something a bit more concrete than is often observed. It is most likely that the Hebrew is referring to the glorious epiphany of Yahweh which was expected to follow shortly upon the exiles' return from exile.<sup>18</sup> If this be the correct interpretation of the verse, then the nominal force of the infinitive is quite integral to the meaning.

A very similar nominal infinitive is found in Malachi 3: 2: (From verse 1)

Behold, I send My messenger, and he will prepare the way before Me. And the Lord, whom you seek, will suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight. Behold, He is coming, says the Lord of hosts. But who can endure the day of his coming? And who can stand when He appears? אֶת־יּוֹם בּוֹאֹ / LXX ημεραν εισοδου αυτου (Cf. the infinitive of Joel 2.31(3.4) ... לפני בּוֹא יוֹם יְהוָה / πριν ελθειν την ημεραν Κυριου την μεγαλην, και επιφανη)

להבנות / του οικοδομησαι The LXX reads the Niphal infinitive as an active infinitive. Stekhoven lists Mi. 4: 10; Jl. 1: 12; Hab. 1: 5 and this passage as cases where the LXX of the MP has an active verb in place of the expected passive:<sup>19</sup>

Mi. 4: 10 תִּנְצַלִּי [you shall be delivered]/ ρυσεται σε [He will deliver you]

Jl. 1: 12 הִכָּיִשׁ שִׁשּׁוֹן מִן־בְּנֵי אָדָם [joy is withered from the sons of men]/ ησχυναν χαραν οι υιοι των ανθρωπων [the sons of men have disgraced joy]

Hab. 1: 5 אִם יספר [if it should be told]/ εαν τις εκδιηγηται [if anyone should tell] The translators might have read יספר as a Piel.

These cases, plus the greater number of cases where the active has been rendered by the passive (see discussion of Hag. 1.9), indicate that the

translators of the MP were quite free about the voice of the verbs. It would be unwise then to assume a different Hebrew Vorlage. The Niphal of בָּנָה in the MP only occurs in: Perfect--Mal. 3.15; Infinit.--Hag. 1.2; Zech. 8.9; Imperfect--Zech. 1.16. In all of these passages (except Haggai), the Greek is passive.

3 και εγενετο λογος κυριου εν χειρι Αγγαιου του προφητου λεγων 4 Ει καιρος υμιν μεν εστι του οικειν εν οικois υμων κοιλοσταθμοis, ο δε οικος ουτος εξηρημωται; 5 και νυν ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Ταξατε δη τας καρδιας υμων εις τας οδους υμων·

Translation: 3 And the word of the Lord came by the hand of Haggai the prophet, saying, 4 Is it time for you to live in your panelled houses--and this house is desolate? 5 And now, thus says the Lord Almighty, Consider your ways.

και εγενετο λογος κυριου εν χειρι Αγγαιου του προφητου λεγων  
: יהי דבר־יהוה ביד־חגי הנביא לאמר

This is an exact and literal rendering of the Hebrew--even to the very word-order.

Ει καιρος υμιν μεν εστι του οικειν εν οικois υμων κοιλοσταθμοis, ο δε οικος ουτος εξηρημωται; הֲעַת לָכֶם אַתֶּם לְשֹׁכֵת בְּבָתֵּיכֶם סְפוּגִים וְהַבֵּית הַזֶּה חֲרָב;

The interrogative ה is indicated by the patah. This particle is nicely rendered by the Greek ει. In Haggai, ει introduces an interrogative clause (always representing the ה) in: Hag. 1.4;2.13(12),14(13),20(19),20(19).

The Greek does not represent the emphatic personal pronoun אֲנִי. On the function of the pronoun in the Hebrew, GKC notes, "Not infrequently the separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows), whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or

preposition (as genitive).<sup>20</sup> An examination of the sampling of passages provided by GKC turns up several other cases of the Greek omitting the emphatic pronoun. It is very likely that these passages merely represent stylistic smoothing of the language by the translators:

I Sam. 25: 24 בִּי־אֲנִי = εν εμοι

2 Chron. 35: 21 לֹא־עָלִיךָ אַתָּה = ουκ επι σε

I Sam. 19: 23 וַתְּהִי עָלָיו גִּם־הוּא רֹחַ = και εγενηθη και επι αυτω πνευμα

κοιλοσταθμοις --(rendering ספונים) This is the only occurrence of the word in the LXX. However, you find the verb κοιλοσταθμειν in III Ki. 6: 9,15 rendering ספן and צפה (Pi.) respectively.

וַיִּבֶן אֶת־הַבַּיִת וַיַּכְלֶהוּ וַיִּסְפֵּן אֶת־הַבַּיִת גָּבִים וַיִּשְׁדֹּרֶת בָּאֲרָזִים : 6: 9  
και ωκοδομησεν τον οικον και συνετελεσεν αυτον· και εκοιλοσταθμησεν τον οικον κεδροις.

עַד־קִירוֹת הַסָּפֵן צָפָה עָץ . . . . 6: 15  
και εως των τοιχων· εκοιλοσταθμησεν συνεχομενα ξυλοις

Liddell and Scott say that the word means, "with coffered ceilings, panelled. . ." They also cite the Flinders Petrie Papyri part 3, p. 143 (III B.C.) to support this meaning (θυριδας κοιλοσταθμους). The masculine noun is defined as a "*coffered ceiling*".<sup>21</sup> The Supplement states under the listing of the word, "after 'Hg.1.4;' add '*with wooden frames,*' and after 'p. 143 (III B.C.)' add' cf. *FCair. Zen.* 764.3 (III B.C.)"<sup>22</sup>

ספן The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain. The word only occurs in I Kgs 6: 9 וַיִּסְפֵּן אֶת־הַבַּיִת גָּבִים; 7: 3 וַיִּסְפֵּן בָּאֲרָז, 7 וַיִּסְפֵּן בָּאֲרָז; Jer. 22: 14 וַיִּסְפֵּן בָּאֲרָז and in this passage. There are two quite different views of the meaning of the word. Winton Thomas argues:

The word **ceiled** is sometimes taken to mean **paneled**. The interpretation would then be that the people are concerned only about lining their own houses with timber (cf. Jer. 22: 14; I Kings 7: 7) instead of being concerned about renewing the woodwork of the temple (cf. I Kings 6: 9), which was destroyed in the flames of 586. It

is more likely, however, that Haggai is here contrasting the people's houses which have roofs--the Hebrew word used (*saphunim*) means, lit., 'covered'--with the temple, which was still without a roof.<sup>23</sup>

However, Petersen counters, "The strongest contrast possible is between 'this house in ruins and your nicely finished houses,' not between 'this house in ruins and your houses with roofs.' The presumption is that the people's houses would have had roofs, since they were, according to the question, living in them."<sup>24</sup> While admitting the difficulty of the question, it does seem that Petersen's view makes the best sense of the word in its context. Furthermore, if the choice of language (both of the Hebrew and the Greek) recalls the language of 1 Kings 6: 9, it can only serve to accentuate the ironic force of the prophetic charge. For the Kings passage is referring to the building and adornment of the temple by Solomon, and that marvelous temple and the work which went into it stand out in sharp contrast to the present incomplete structure and the people's resistance to get on with the work.

Although the evidence is rather divided for reading the  $\mu\omega\nu$  in "your houses" it is in the Göttingen LXX and Rahlfs. The  $\mu\omega\nu$  is missing or not represented in S<sup>ca</sup> A' Q' 49' 198 233' 407' 449' (770\*) 456 534 130' Co Aeth Arab Arm Cyr.1196 Bas.N. Ambr. The reading is supported by B S\* W and Cyr. The reading of the Hebrew text is equally uncertain for it is not supported by the Targums or the Vulgate. Petersen argues:

Nevertheless, the MT remains, in my judgment, the better reading. With the pronominal suffix, the noun is made definite and the presumption that the people's houses are in existence and inhabited is made much stronger. And this seems to be exactly the point raised by the question. The populace is now living in well-built homes while Yahweh's house is still in ruins.<sup>25</sup>

Petersen has no doubt nicely articulated the superiority of the reading from a logical and literary point of view. But this very argument can be



reversed--for it is very clear that the reading with the pronoun is more fluent and less difficult and more likely to be the product of later smoothing. The more difficult reading (which is very widely attested) and the reading more likely to represent the original is כבתים as suggested tentatively ("prp") by the editors of Stuttgartensia.

εξηρημωται חרב

εξερημουν occurs in the MP only in: Ho 13.15; Am 7.9; Na 1.4; Zeph. 3.6 and here in Haggai. In every instance the Greek is a rendering of חרב either in the Qal or the Hiphil. Evidently the translator took the Hebrew form as the perfect of the stative verb. Even the vocalisation permits such a judgment. However, it is more likely the masculine adjective as in 1.9. The translators of the LXX treated the adjective with a good bit of freedom:

Lev. 7.10 וכל־מנחה כלולה־בשמן וחרבה [and every offering moistened with oil or dry] / και πασα θυσια αναπεποιημενη εν ελαιω και μη αναπεποιημενη [and every sacrifice prepared with oil or not prepared]

Prov. 17.1 טוב פת חרבה [Better is a dry morsel] / κρεισσων ψωμος [Better is a morsel]

Jer. 33.10 חרב / LXX 40.10 ερημος

Jer. 33.12 החרב / LXX 40.12 ερημω

Ezek. 36.35 והערים החרבות / αι πολεις αι ερημοι

Ezek. 36.38 הערים החרבות / αι πολεις αι ερημοι

Hag. 1.9 אשר־הוא חרב / εστιν ερημος

Neh. 2.3 חרבה ... העיר / η πολις ... ηρημωθη

Neh. 2.17 ירושלם חרבה / Ιερουσαλημ ερημος

The appropriateness of the Hebrew root is nicely explained by Petersen:

The adjective *haleb* is appropriate in this context for another reason. It occurs in the first verse of the oracle delivered to Zerubbabel and Joshua, and ultimately to the people. And in the final verse of this same oracle (v. 11), the prophet uses a term--*haleb*--composed of the same three root consonants, *hltb*, to describe the divine fury in the form of a drought that has afflicted the land of Judah. This root,



*hrb*, establishes an *inclusio* around this almost essay-like collection of prophetic rhetoric and thereby emphasizes the dire situation the Judahites confront—one of devastation and drought.<sup>26</sup>

και νυν ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Ταξατε δη τας καρδιας υμων  
τας οδους υμων· יְעַתָּה כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאֵיָהּ שִׁימוּ לִבְכֶּם עַל-דִּרְכֵיכֶם:

The Greek τασσω + καρδια only occurs five times outside the LXX, and then only in the ecclesiastical writers Athanasius and Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>27</sup>

The only other cases of τασσω + καρδια in the LXX are:

Lam. 3.21 (rendering שׁוֹבֵי Hi.) ταυτην ταξω εις την καρδιαν μου

Ezek. 40.4 και ταξον εις την καρδιαν σου παντα οσα εγω δεικνυω σοι

Ezek. 44.5 ταξον εις την καρδιαν σου

Ezek. 44.5 ταξεις την καρδιαν σου εις την εισοδον του οικου

Zech. 7.12 και την καρδιαν αυτων εταξαν απειθη του μη εισακουειν -- and they made their heart disobedient to not obey

Hag. 2.18 has the similar υποταξατε δη τας καρδιας υμων . . . θεσθε εν ταις καρδιαις υμων [Note that all the manuscripts in fact have ταξατε except W, B, and S\*. Ziegler views the ταξατε to be the result of assimilation toward 1.5.]

6 εσπειρατε πολλα και εισηνεγκατε ολιγα, εφαγετε και ουκ εις πλησμονην, επιετε και ουκ εις μεθην, περιεβαλεσθε και ουκ εθερμανθητε εν αυτοις, και ο τους μισθους συναγων συνηγαγεν εις δεσμον τετρυπημενον. 7 ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Θεσθε τας καρδιας υμων εις τας οδους υμων· 8 αναβητε επι το ορος και κοψατε ξυλα και οικοδομησατε τον οικον, και ευδοκησω εν αυτω και ενδοξασθησομαι, ειπε κυριος.

Translation: 6 You have sown much but brought in little, you have eaten but not to fullness, you have drunk but not to drunkenness, you have dressed yourselves but you are not warmed in them, and the one collecting the wages collects it into a pierced bag. 7 Thus says the Lord Almighty, Consider your ways. 8 Go up upon the mountain and cut wood and build the house, and I will take pleasure in it and I will be glorified, says the Lord.



εσπειρατε πολλα και εισηνεγκατε ολιγα זרעתם הרבה והבא מעט  
 הרבה is the Hiphil infinitive absolute. It might be functioning  
 adverbially-- "greatly, exceedingly" or it might be functioning  
 substantivally (Cf. BDB p. 915). The same uncertainty attaches to מעט  
 which can function substantivally or adverbally (Cf. BDB p. 589). It does,  
 however, seem most likely that מעט is functioning as a substantive as it  
 usually does. If this be correct, the Hebrew is likely to be reading הרבה  
 in a similar way--thus being balanced. The occurrences of εισφέρειν in  
 the MP are: Jl.3.(4)5; Hag. 1.6,9; Mal. 1.13; 3.10

εφαγετε και ουκ εις πλησμονην, επιετε και ουκ εις μεθην, περιεβαλεσθε  
 και ουκ εθερμανθητε εν αυτοις, אכול ואין-לשבעה שתו ואין-לשכרה

Whereas the Hebrew has switched from 2 perfects in the first clause of 6  
 to infinitive absolutes, the LXX continues with the aorists. Although the  
 LXX can at times treat the Inf. absolute very very literally, it renders the  
 Hebrew in a number of different ways.<sup>28</sup> It would indeed be foolhardy to  
 imagine a different Hebrew than we see in the MT merely on the grounds  
 of these infinitives being translated as aorists.

לֹא לְבוֹשׁ ואין-לחם לוֹ The precise syntactical function of the לוֹ is unclear.  
 BDB (p. 517) notes that it is quite common for ל to be used in the  
 complement of verbal clauses with the infinitive. Often the preposition  
 thus indicates what would best be translated as the object of the verb.  
 אֵין which indicates negative predication will not have an object. Est. 8.8  
 has a similar construction which is translated hyper-literally "there is no  
 revoking it" [אין להשיב]. Perhaps the Hebrew here should be rendered  
 "there is no warmth in it". In this case "it" would refer to the act of

dressings. Of course the Hebrew might mean "for him." The LXX with its *εν αυτοις* has either taken the phrase to refer to the plural "you" which it has continued --thus "among them who dress" or to the implied *ιματια* which is suggested by the verb *περιβαλλω* --thus "in them"-- that is the clothes you put on.

και ο τους μισθους συναγων συνηγαγεν εις δεσμον τετρυπημενον.

והמשתכר מל-צדק נקב:

Two other occurrences of *δεσμος* which are renderings of *צדק* and mean "purse" or "bundle" or something of that nature (perhaps "moneybelt") are found in Gen. 42: 35 *εγενετο δε εν τω κατακενουν αυτους τους σακκους αυτων και ην εκαστου ο δεσμος του αργυριου εν τω σακκω αυτων· και ειδον τους δεσμους του αργυριου αυτων, αυτοι και ο πατηρ αυτων, και εφοβηθησαν.*

ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Θεσθε τας καρδιας υμων εις τας οδους υμων  
 כה אמר יהוה צבאות שימו לבבכם על-דרכיכם:

*לב/τιθημι καρδια* are the fixed idiom and stereotypical rendering.

θ αναβητε επι το ορος και κοψατε ξυλα και οικοδομησατε τον οικον, και ευδοκησω εν αυτω και ενδοξασθησομαι, ειπε κυριος.

עלו ההר והבאתם עץ ובנו הבית

Nowack and Budde suggest that the *Vorlage* of the LXX was *והבאתם*<sup>29</sup>

The suggestion is utterly without merit. The verb is used

in the Piel to refer to the cutting down of a forest only in the sense of clearing the land. The wood which might result from the verbal activity is never in view: Josh. 17: 15 *εκκαθαρον*, 18 *εκκαθαρις*. And the fact that the Hebrew verb is never rendered by the Greek *κοπτω* further reduces the plausibility of the suggestion. The translator was simply

clarifying that before one could bring wood it would have to be cut.

Although several manuscripts have *οισατε* or *-ετε* ( 87°, 68, L' Th.) which would correspond to the Hebrew, the vast majority of the manuscripts have *κοψατε* (*-ετε*).

וְאֶרְצָהּ בָּנוּ וְאֶכְבַּד אֶמַר יְהוָה:

ευδοκησω εν αυτω και ενδοξασθησομαι, ειπε κυριος.

ευδοκεω occurs in the MP only in Hb 2.4; Hg 1.8 and Mal 2.17

Hb. 2.4 if he should draw back, my soul ουκ ευδοκει εν αυτω

Mal. 2.17 και εν αυτοις αυτος ευδοκησε

ενδοξαζω occurs only here in the MP. The Kethib is the Imperfect (וְאֶכְבַּד) while the Qere is the Cohortative (וְאֶכְבַּדְּךָ). In this context, the force of the Imperfect would be quite clear. *ενδοξαζω* is a rendering of כָּבַד in the Niphal in:

Ex. 14.4,17,17 in Pharoah

IV Ki. 14.10 stay home and glorify yourself

Ezek. 28.22 and I will be glorified in you (in the judgments on Sidon)

The verb is an interesting septuagintal addition in Ezek. 38.23:

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַעְךָ וְנִדְעָתִי לְעֵינֵי גִּוִּים רַבִּים

και μεγαλυνθησομαι και αγιασθησομαι και ενδοξασθησομαι και  
γνωσθησομαι εναντιον εθνων πολλων

9 επεβλεψατε εις πολλα, και εγενετο ολιγα· και εισηνεχθη εις τον οικον, και εξεφυσησα αυτα. δια τουτο ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Ανθων ο οικος μου εστιν ερημος, υμεις δε διωκετε εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου, 10 δια τουτο ανεξει ο ουρανός απο δροσου, και η γη υποστελειται τα εκφορια αυτης· 11 και επαξω ρομφαιαν επι την γην και επι τα ορη και επι τον σιτον και επι τον οινον και επι το ελαιον και οσα εκφερει η γη και επι τους ανθρωπους και επι τα κτηνη και επι παντας τους πονους των χειρων αυτων.

Translation: 9 You looked for much and little came; and it was brought into the house and I blew it away. Therefore, thus says the Lord Almighty, Because my house is desolate--but each one of you runs to his

house; 10 therefore heaven shall abstain from dew, and the earth shall withhold its produce; 11 and I will bring a sword upon the land and upon the mountains and upon the grain and upon the wine and upon the oil and upon whatsoever the land produces and upon the men and upon the cattle and upon all the labours of your hands.

## פנה אל־הרבה והנה למעט 9

Once again the LXX renders the inf. abs. with an aorist--επεβλεψατε

BHS suggests that εγενετο was likely translating וַהֲיָה rather than the הִנֵּה of the MT. This is very plausible on orthographic grounds inasmuch as the ancient ך and the ancient ך looked quite similar. Furthermore, this reading is perhaps supported by the Syriac and the Targums. However, instances where הִנֵּה seems to be rendered by εγενετο include:

Ex. 4.6 and his hand had become as white as snow [και εγενηθη η χειρ αυτου ωσει χιων]

Isa. 59.9 while they waited for light, darkness was upon them [υπομειναντων αυτων φως εγενετο αυτοις σκοτος]

Eze. 33.32 and you are to them as the sound of a psaltery [και γινη αυτοις ως φωνη ψαλτηριον] Koehler/Baumgartner (p. 239) notes that the Hebrew

הִנֵּה occurs "after verbs of perceiving and communicating-- הִנֵּה

frequently precedes the perception and information proper." The

perceptual focus of the four passages in question is quite clear. Thus to

alter the MT on the basis of the Greek would likely be a move toward

eliminating a well-known and well-used Hebrew idiom. And as J. M. P.

Smith observes, the common view that the וַהֲיָה is required because of

the following ל is quite wrong for as he notes, "It is clear, however, from

Gn. 18<sup>9</sup> that הִנֵּה can properly be employed in place of the vb. even before a preposition."<sup>30</sup> [הנה בא־הל] Dingermann's suggestion that in all four of

the passages the Greek translator has committed an "Irrung des Auges"<sup>31</sup>

is preferable to the view that there is something defective in the MT as it stands (which there is not). Yet, it is one of the common characteristics of ancient translation that idioms and metaphorical language are often

stripped down to their primal meanings. That is a fully adequate explanation of the present situation and somewhat reduces the apparent cumulative force of the agreement of LXX, the Peshitta and the Targums.

והבאתם הבית ונפחתי בו / και εισηνεχθη εις τον οικον, και εξεφυσησα αυτα.

The change from the Hebrew "you brought *it into* the house" to the Greek "it was brought into the house" likely reflects nothing but a measure of stylistic freedom on the part of the LXX translator. Stekhoven lists this passage as one of 16 in the MP where the LXX renders an active Hebrew verb with the Greek passive:<sup>32</sup>

- Hos. 4: 12 רוח זנונים התעה / πνευματι πορνειας επλανηθησαν  
 Mi. 2: 4 יהא עליכם משל ונהה נהי / λημθησεται εφ υμας παραβολη και  
 θρηνηθησεται θρηνος  
 Mi. 5: 5 והקמנו עליו שכעה רעים / επεγερθησονται επ αυτον επτα  
 ποιμενες  
 Mi. 6: 5 למען דעת צדקות יהוה / οπως γνωσθη η δικαιοσυνη του κυριου  
 Mi. 6: 8 הגיד לך / ανηγγελη σοι  
 Mi. 6: 11 האזכה במאזני רשע / δικαιωθησεται εν ζυγω ανομος  
 Mi. 6: 14 ואשר תפלט לחרב אתן / οσοι εαν διασωθωσιν εις ρομπαιαν  
 παραδοθησονται  
 Am. 5: 16 וקראו אפר / κληθησεται γεωργος  
 Am. 8: 7 אם-אשכח לנצח כל-מעשיהם / ει επιλησθησεται εις νεικος  
 παντα τα εργα υμων  
 Ob. 6 איך נחפשו עשו / πως εξηρευνηθη Ησαυ  
 Jo. 1: 5 מהקל מעליהם / του κουφισθηναι απ αυτων  
 Jo. 3: 7 ויזעק ויאמר / και εκηρυχθη και ερρεθη  
 Hab. 3: 6 ויתר גוים / διετακτη εθνη  
 Zeph. 2: 4 אשדוד בצהרים יגרשוה / και Αζωτος μεσημβριας εκριφησεται  
 Hag. 1: 9 והבאתם הבית / και εισηνεχθη εις τον οικον  
 Mal. 1: 4 וקראו להם / επικληθησεται αυτοις

Although Stekhoven's collection of passages is helpful, it should be noted that Obadiah 6 is passive in the Hebrew and merely involves a collective

noun having a plural verb in the Hebrew and a singular verb in the Greek. Furthermore, in noting Hebrew actives rendered freely with Greek passives, it would be appropriate to note the Hebrew clauses which while using an active verb are what is referred to as an "impersonal passive."<sup>33</sup> Surely in the case of this Hebrew idiom, it is not at all surprising or noteworthy that the translators used the passive voice. It is possible that one finds the impersonal passive in Micah 2: 4; 6: 5; Amos 5: 16; Zeph. 2: 4 and Mal. 1: 4. But even if this is the case (and it is very hard to be sure), there remain ten rather clear instances of actual free rendering of the voice of the verb (Hebrew active » Greek passive).

και εξεφυσησα αυτα      ונפחתיו בו

εκφυσω renders נפח (Qal) in Ezek. 22: 20,21 and נפח (Hi.) in Mal. 1: 13

δια τουτο ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Ανθων ο οικος μου εστιν  
ερημος,      יען מה נאם יהוה צבאות יען ביתי אשר-הוא חרב

The occurrences of δια τουτο in the MP are:

Hos. 2: 8 (6 MT) לבן, Hos. 2: 11 (9 MT) לבן, Hos. 2: 16 (14 MT) לבן, Hos. 4: 3  
לבן, Hos. 4: 13 על-בן, Hos. 6: 5 על-בן, Hos. 8: 10 גם פי- לבן, Hos. 9: 6  
לבן, Hos. 13: 3 לבן, Amos 2: 13 --, Amos 3: 2 על-בן, Amos 3: 11 לבן,  
Amos 4: 12 לבן, Amos 5: 11 δια τουτο ανθων / לבן יען, Amos 5: 13 לבן,  
Amos 5: 16 לבן, Amos 6: 7 לבן, Amos 7: 17 לבן, Mi. 1: 14 לבן, Mi. 2: 3 לבן,  
Mi. 2: 5 לבן, Mi. 2: 9 --, Mi. 3: 6 לבן, Mi. 3: 12 לבן, Mi. 5: 2 לבן, Jon. 4: 2  
לבן, Hab. 1: 4 על-בן, Hab. 1: 17 בן, Zeph. 2: 9 לבן, Zeph. 3: 8 לבן, Hag. 1:  
9 יען מה, Hag. 1: 10 על-בן, Zech. 1: 16 לבן, Zech. 9: 4 הנה, Zech. 10: 2  
לבן, Zech. 11: 6 פי

Of particular interest are:

Hos. 8: 9-10 LXX οτι αυτοι ανεβησαν εις Ασσυριους: ανεθαλε<sup>1</sup> καθ εαυτον  
Εφραιμ, δωρα ηγαπησαν<sup>2</sup> δια τουτο<sup>3</sup> παραδοθησονται<sup>2</sup> εν τοις εθνεσι. νυν  
εισδεξομαι αυτους, και κοπασουσι<sup>4</sup> μικρον του χρειν βασιλεα και  
αρχοντας.<sup>5</sup> [For they have gone up to the Assyrians: Ephraim has sprouted  
again by himself; they loved gifts, therefore they shall be given over *as s*



*gift* to the nations. Now, I shall receive them and they shall cease for a little while from anointing a king and princes.]

Hebrew בִּי־הֵמָּה עָלוּ אֲשׁוּר פָּרָא בֹדֵד לוֹ אֲפָרִים הִתְנֶנּוּ אֱהָבִים:

גַּם בִּי־יִתְּנוּ בָגוֹיִם עֵתָּה אֶקְבָּצֵם וַיִּחְלֹן מֵעַטְמִמִּשָּׂא מֶלֶךְ שׁוּרִים:

[For they have gone up to Assyria, a wild ass alone by himself: Ephraim has hired lovers. Yes, though they have hired among the nations, now I will gather them; and they shall sorrow a little because of the oracle of the king of princes.] The Greek, which can only be described as having a very complex and subtle connection to the Hebrew derives from a number of confused/creative? readings: 1. פָּרָא ("zebra, wild ass") read as though פָּרָח (Hi. "to sprout, bud, bloom" as rendered in Ezek. 17: 24), 2. אֱהָבִים הִתְנֶנּוּ / δῶρα παραπομπήσων is difficult to understand. If the translator viewed אֱהָבִים in a gnostic sense, then the aorist is understandable. It is more

difficult to imagine why δῶρα might be connected with הִתְנֶנּוּ. Perhaps the best guess is that the translator gave up on the Hebrew before him and guessed at the argument and in the process created a little word-play. For the Hebrew word-play פָּרָא/אֲפָרִים is written out of the Greek while a new word-play is created by the Greek translators with δῶρα/παραδοθήσονται. (LS p. 465 suggests that the noun δῶρον is etymologically related to the verb δίδωμι.), 3. The explicit inferential force of διὰ τοῦτο far exceeds the force of גַּם כִּי as it would naturally be read in this context. 4. וַיִּחְלֹן is unintelligible and is typically emended

as וַיִּחְלֹל (חיל/חיל) or as וַיִּחְלֹל [See the note in BDB p. 320 and KB p. 303 where it is suggested that the latter emendation based on the LXX is superior. However, the vast amount of rewriting going on in the LXX of this passage makes all speculations about a differing *Vorlage* extremely precarious. If any sense in the Hebrew is to be found, it is perhaps most promising to imagine an ellipsis of the word *vow* or *word* in the expression "to profane or break one's vow or word" (as in Num. 30: 3, see KB p. 303 #3.)] 5. The Hebrew phrase "because of the oracle of the king of

princes" has been rewritten as though מַמְשָׁחִים were מַמְשָׁח. After that change, מֶלֶךְ שָׂרִיסִים was read as a compound object of the infinitive מַשֵּׁחַ rather than as a genitive phrase.

Mi. 2: 9 δια τουτο<sup>1</sup> ηγουμενοι<sup>2</sup> λαου μου απορριψησονται<sup>3</sup> εκ των οικιων τρυφης αυτων, δια<sup>4</sup> τα πονηρα επιτηδευματα αυτων<sup>5</sup> εξωσθησαν·  
εγγισατε ορεσιν αιωνιος. [Therefore, the leaders of my people shall be cast forth from their luxurious houses, because of their evil practices they are rejected. Draw near to the everlasting mountains.]

נָשִׂי עַמִּי תִגְרְשׁוּן מִבֵּית תַּעֲנִיגָהּ מֵעַל עֲלִילָהּ תִּקְחוּ הָדָרִי לְעוֹלָם:

[The women of my people have you cast out from their pleasant houses; from their children have you taken away my glory for ever.]<sup>34</sup>

1. The causal δια τουτο is probably simply an explanatory addition indicating the logical force assumed and implied by the translator's handling of the other components of the verse. 2. Read as though נְשִׂאִי  
3. Of decisive impact on the translator's treatment of the passage is his viewing the imperfect (or preterite minus waw consecutive) תִּגְרְשׁוּן in a future sense. The תַּפְשׁוּטִין + יְקוֹמָם + אֶתְמוֹל of the preceding verse makes such a future reference quite extrinsic to the thought of the Hebrew and proves it an unlikely rendering of the form in the context. The translator appears to have had no idea what was going on in verse 8! 4. LXX reads מַעַל with a causative rather than a separative force. 5. עֲלִילָהּ read as though מַעַלֵּל or עֲלִילָהּ (both which refer to a deed, possibly good but usually bad). Except for the obvious interchange of הָרִי / הָרִי (note the plural in the construct state would be the very similar הָרִי / הָרִי, the rest of the verse is quite inexplicable.

Zech. 9: 4 In the rendering of הִנֵּה by δια τουτο there is certainly no major change, but it does involve the Greek's making the logical force more



explicit than the Hebrew.

It can be concluded with some confidence that the translator of the Minor Prophets was quite capable of making an alteration to the logical force of the text both where he is involved in a massive rewriting of the text or where he is subtly making explicit what was left implicit in the Hebrew. Somewhere within this broad range of possibilities lies our text of Hag. 1: 9. The contextual forces at work in the mind of the translator in this instance will be shown in the discussion of the rest of the paragraph.

9 ἐπεβλεψατε εἰς πολλὰ, καὶ ἐγένετο ὀλίγα· καὶ εἰσηνεχθῆ εἰς τὸν οἶκον, καὶ ἐξεφύσησα αὐτὰ. διὰ τοῦτο ταῦδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Ἀνθ' ὧν ὁ οἶκος μου ἐστὶν ἐρημος, ὑμεῖς δὲ διώκετε ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, 10 διὰ τοῦτο ἀνεξεί ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπο ὄρουσος, καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποστελεῖται τὰ ἐκφόρια αὐτῆς· 11 καὶ ἐπαξῶ ρομφαίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν σίτον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐλαιοὺν καὶ ὅσα ἐκφέρει ἡ γῆ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ κτήνη καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πόνους τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.

The remarkable difference between the Greek and Hebrew is the fact that the Greek has cast the time of the woes into the future, making it a threat,<sup>35</sup> while the Hebrew text has God providing an explanation for present problems. [ἀνεξεί/יִנְלָב, ὑποστελεῖται/יִנְלָב, ἐπαξῶ/נִהְרַנִּי  
T I V T

(ambiguous in an unpointed text)] There are two very likely explanations for this intentional change--logical and rhetorical. With reference to the logic of the passage, commentators on the Hebrew text are all concerned to explain how it could be that the people could have been living in such nice panelled houses if they were in the midst of such a terrible drought. There are a variety of ways around the problem, but there is no doubt that the initial impression the text makes is that there is something quite incongruous in the two statements. Secondly, at the rhetorical level, the Hebrew text of verse nine seems to misfire. As Petersen notes:

"Therefore the divine agent himself raises the obvious question, 'For what reason?' and immediately provides an answer. Interestingly, the answer provides no new information. It repeats what was adduced in v. 4, namely, that Yahweh's house lies in ruins."<sup>36</sup> It is in view of these two infelicities that the Greek translator decided to improve his text.

δια τουτο ανεξει ο ουρανος απο δροσου על-כן עליכם בלאו שמים מטר  
It is at once obvious that the Greek text does not represent עליכם. The meaning of the Hebrew phrase is variously assessed as "over you", "because of you", or perhaps most likely "against you." BHS suggests that עליכם should be deleted on the grounds that it is not represented in the LXX and likely represents dittography. Rudolph, on the other hand, mentions that the Peshitta does not represent על-כן. He suspects that both the Syriac and the LXX are best understood as the result of haplography.<sup>37</sup> This is of course very possible, but since the Greek text seems to be the result of a rather substantial reworking, we cannot be sure.

It is immediately obvious that there is a close and definite relationship between this passage and Zechariah 8: 9-13. In the Zechariah passage, there is a rather explicit reversal of the conditions described in Haggai 1.<sup>38</sup> The LXX of Zech. 8: 9-13 reads:

Thus says the Lord Almighty, 'Let the hands of you who are hearing these words from the mouth of the prophets in these days be strong, from the day in which the house of the Lord Almighty was founded and from the time in which the temple was built.' Because, before those days, there will be no reward unto profit, and there will be no reward for the beasts, and there will be no peace from affliction for the one going out and the one going in. And I will send forth all men, each one against his neighbor. But now, I will not do to the remnant of this people as in the former days, says the Lord Almighty, but I will show

peace. The vine will give its fruit, and the earth will give her produce, and the heaven will give its dew and I will give as an inheritance all these things to the remnant of my people. And it shall be the case that in the same way in which you were cursed among the nations, Oh house of Judah and house of Israel, thus I will save you and you will be blessed. Be of good cheer and be strong in your hands.

The part of the paragraph which does not seem to cohere with the rest is verse 10. The future tense of the section seems entirely out of place.

Yet, it must be noted that the Hebrew itself raises the temporal ambiguities which at this point the LXX has merely passed on. The Hebrew reads:

בִּי לִפְנֵי הַיָּמִים הָהֵם שֹׁכֵר הָאָדָם לֹא נִהְיָה וְשֹׁכֵר הַבְּהֵמָה אֵינָנָה  
וְלִיּוֹצֵא וּלְבָא אֵין-שְׁלוֹם מִן-הַצָּר וְאֶשְׁלַח אֶת-כָּל-הָאָדָם אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ:

The two problems are that one finds "those days" הַיָּמִים הָהֵם rather than the expected "these days" הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּה, and the fact that one does not find the "waw-consecutive" expected for the prefixed form וְאֶשְׁלַח. And the problem is certainly compounded by the fact that these difficulties have the appearance of being related to one another. They both pertain to the relative time of the action. With respect to the verbal problem, it is surely reasonable to acknowledge that the future time of the verb simply will not do in the context. The objections against the future are ancient and virtually unanimous. As Rudolph states, "Es ist notwendig, 'וָא' zu lesen. Schon Hieronymus hat die Umsetzung aller Verbalformen in V. 10 (außer ὑπαρχει) ins Futurum bei LXX bemängelt."<sup>39</sup> But there are good alternatives to repointing the text. Davidson states, "In some cases vav

impf. is pointed as simple vav, e.g. Is. 10.13 וְאֶסִּיד, 43.28

וְאֶחָלַל, 48.3; 51.2; 57.17; 63.3-5, Zech. 8.10, Ps. 104.32;

107.26-29. In most of these cases the peculiarity belongs to the first pers. In some of them the vav has evidently conversive

force, e.g. Is. 43.28; 51.2; in others, e.g. Is. 10.13, it may be doubtful whether the impf. be not a graphic pres. or freq."<sup>40</sup>

Gesenius mentions Ez. 16: 10 **וְאִכְסַךְ** and 2 Sa. 1: 10 **וְאִמְלִיתָהוּ** as

exceptions to the rule concerning the proper pointing for the waw consecutive.<sup>41</sup>

The passages (excepting the Psalms, where the verbal system is quite different) are rendered thus: Is. 10.13 **וְאִסִּיר** / ἀφελω, **וְאִוְרִיד** / προνομευσω; 43.28 **וְאִחַלֵּל** / εμianαν; 48.3 **וְאִשְׁמִיעַם** / ακουστον εγενετο; 51.2 **וְאִבְרַכְהוּ** / ευλογησα, **וְאִרְבֶּהוּ** / πληθυννα; 57.17 **וְאִכְבֶּהוּ** / επαταξα, **וְאִקְצֶהוּ** / ελυπηθη; 63.3-5 **וְאִדְרִכֶּם** / κατεπατησα, **וְאִרְמָם** / κατεθλασσα, **וְאִיִּי** / κατηγαγον, **וְאִבִּיט** / επεβλεψα, **וְאִשְׁתַּחֲוֶימָם** / προσενοησα, **וְאִכֹּנֶם** / κατεπατησα, **וְאִוְרִיד** / κατηγαγον; Ez. 16.10 **וְאִכְסַךְ** / περιεβαλον; 2 Sa. 1.10 **וְאִמְלִיתָהוּ** / εθανατωσα

It is quite clear that in all of the examples considered but one (Isa. 10.13), the translator rendered the Hebrew with the aorist. But in Is. 43.28 there is an unexpected change in person and in Is. 48.3 the verb is rendered as a periphrastic passive. The whole of Is. 63.3-6 is rendered very freely. All in all, it appears that the Greek translators generally interpreted the form in a way which was appropriate to the context. And it seems best not to imagine either a deliberate alteration by the scribes of the Hebrew text for the purpose of making some past situation yet future (in the MT), or to suppose that we are dealing with really unusual syntactical uses of the imperfect tense. Rather, it looks like a symptom of the phonological/morphological peculiarities of the guttural **א**. It is likely just a case of irregular "implied doubling" in an instance where one expects the traditional "compensatory lengthening."<sup>42</sup>

It is quite possible that the translator of the Minor Prophets was slightly

confused by his inherited vocalisation system in Zech. 8: 10, and then to have let his rendering of that passage influence his rendering in Haggai. If in Zechariah he took the abrupt change of tense quite seriously, then the coming blessings are merely a temporary reprieve which will precede that ultimate judgment of the future spoken of in verse ten. This would have the ultimate effect on the thought of the passage in Zech., of relativizing the blessings to that of temporary and non-eschatological benefits, for the great day of judgment is yet future.<sup>43</sup> The effect on the passage in Haggai is surely to cast the judgment into the eschatological future. This is made quite clear by the unambiguous apocalyptic re-reading of the LXX of Haggai 2: 6a. The two passages must be viewed in relation to one another.

11 και επαξω ρομφαιαν επι την γην και επι τα ορη και επι τον σιτον και επι τον οινον και επι το ελαιον και οσα εκφερε η γη και επι τους ανθρωπους και επι τα κτηνη και επι παντας τους πονους των χειρων αυτων.

ואקרא חרב על-הארץ ועל-ההרים ועל-ההדגן ועל-התירוש ועל-היצהר ועל אשר תוציא האדמה ועל-האדם ועל-הבהמה ועל כל-יגיע כפים:

One immediately notices that the LXX has apparently read *hereb* instead of *horeb*. The Peshitta follows the LXX in this reading. Every other occurrence of *hereb* in the MP (25x) has the expected ρομφαιαν.

The LXX renders *horeb* with the following:

διψω Is 25.4,5

ερημος Is 61.4

καυμα Gen 31.40; Jb 30.30; Is 4.6; Jer 43(36).30

καυσων Gen 31.40

ξηρασια Jud 6.37,39,40

The only other occurrence of *horeb* in the MP is in Zeph. 2.14: MT

"desolation shall be at the threshold" /LXX "and ravens in her porches" και κορακες εν τοις πυλωσιν αυτης [In 10 of 11 occurrences of κοραξ in the LXX, it is rendering the Hebrew noun עֶרֶב The odd passage is Zeph. 2.14.

The phonological similarity of the ancient פ and ע, makes it very likely that the translator of the MP did not know what to make of the noun הֶרֶב. Thus he repointed it in Hag. and in Zeph. merely chose a phonologically similar word to fill in what must have been to him a non-intelligible semantic gap. This constitutes rather compelling evidence that the LXX translator was in fact looking at the same Hebrew as that in the MT and that at least in the case of Zeph. 2.14 the vocalisation system resembled that of the MT.

This is the only place where the LXX translates the Hebrew אָרָק with the Greek verb επαγω. This anomalous rendering is likely just another aspect of his making sense of the following word.

וְעַל אֲשֶׁר תֹּצִיא הָאֲדָמָה The preposition is not repeated in the LXX.

וְעַל כָּל־יָגִיעַ כַּפִּים: και επι παντας τους πονους των χειρων αυτων.

Both the LXX and the Peshitta have an extra pronoun here. This is likely just smoothing out of the rather peculiar Hebrew (all the other instances of this Hebrew duo have the personal suffix--Ps 128.2; Gen 31.42; Job 10.3). The surprise is that one finds the 3rd plural rather than the expected 2nd plural. The third plural pronoun must be the result of the attraction toward ανθρωπους.

τους πονους The Hebrew singular is rendered by the Greek plural in: Dt 28.33; Ps 78.46; Ps 109.11; Jer 20.5; Ez 23.29. It is never rendered by the Greek singular.

12 και ηκουσε Ζοροβαβελ ο του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα και Ιησους ο του



Ἰωσεδεκ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας καὶ πάντες οἱ καταλοίποι τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν λόγων Ἀγγαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καθοτι ἐξαπεστείλεν αὐτὸν κύριος πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐφοβήθη ὁ λαὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου.

Translation: 12 And Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah, and Joshua, the son of Josedek, the high priest, and all the remnant of the people, heard the voice of their God and the words of Haggai the prophet, just as the Lord sent him to them. And the people were afraid before the Lord.

εκ φυλῆς Ἰουδα This phrase is not represented in the Hebrew and this might suggest that its occurrence elsewhere might represent more than a mere misreading of פָּחַת (i.e. emphasis on his messianic typology).

καθοτι only occurs 5 other times in the LXX of the MP:

Mi. 7.20 אֲשֶׁר which you have sworn to our fathers

Joel 2.32(3.5) כַּאֲשֶׁר as the Lord has said

Zech. 7.3 כַּאֲשֶׁר just as I have done

Zech. 10.8 כַּמֹּד just as they once increased

Mal. 4.4(3.22) אֲשֶׁר which I commanded him

ἐξαπεστείλεν αὐτὸν κύριος πρὸς αὐτοὺς שְׁלַחוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

Rahlfs has ἐξαπεστείλεν αὐτὸν κύριος [ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν] πρὸς αὐτοὺς

He does not discuss the reading in the apparatus but the Göttingen LXX indicates that reading is found only in the Codex Venetus, the Old Latin Fragmenta Sangallensia, some Ethiopic fragments, and Cyril of Alexandria (some manuscripts).

The Hebrew behind πρὸς αὐτοὺς is אֱלֵיהֶם. This reading is supported by the Peshitta, the Targums (codex Reuchlinianus), and the Vulgate. The strength of these witnesses makes it very likely that the MT has omitted the word by haplography. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the Greek



support for the double reading is so weak.

και εφοβηθη ο λαος απο προσωπου κυριου יִירָאֵן הָעַם מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה

In the MP απο προσωπου renders the Hebrew מִפְּנֵי in:

Hos. 10.15 thus will I do to you because of the unrighteousness of your sins

Mi. 1.4 like wax before the fire

Jl. 2.6 before them

Hab. 2.20 the Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth fear before Him.

Zeph. 1.7 fear ye before the Lord God

Hag. 1.12 and in the gloss of 2.15(14)

Zech. 2.13(17) let all flesh fear before the Lord: for he has risen up from his holy clouds

The Hebrew phrase יִירָאֵן מִפְּנֵי means to stand in awe before someone.<sup>44</sup>

As is evident from the Greek usage, the Greek can have the same nuance.

13 και ειπεν Αγγαιος αγγελος κυριου [εν αγγελοις Κυριου]\* τω λαω Εγω ειμι μεθ υμων, λεγει κυριος. 14 και εξηγειρε κυριος το πνευμα Ζοροβαβελ του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα και το πνευμα Ιησου του Ιωσεδεκ του ιερεως του μεγαλου και το πνευμα των καταλοιπων παντος του λαου, και εισηλθον και εποιουν εργα εν τω οικω κυριου παντοκρατορος θεου αυτων 15 τη τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος του εκτου τω δευτερω ετει επι Δαρειου του βασιλεως.

Translation: 13 And Haggai, the angel of the Lord, spoke to the people, I am with you, says the Lord. 14 And the Lord raised up the spirit of Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah and the spirit of Joshua the son of Josedek the high priest and the spirit of the remnant of all the people, and they entered and did work in the house of the Lord Almighty their God on the twenty-fourth *day* of the sixth month in the second year of Darius the king.

[εν αγγελοις Κυριου]\* Although this interesting little phrase is not in the actual text either of Rahlfs or Göttingen, it has very strong manuscript

support. It is found in B S\* V C 68 Arm Cyr.<sup>F</sup> Syh. It is taken to be an explanatory gloss on the previous reference to Haggai being an ἀγγελος κυριου by Dingermann.<sup>45</sup> However, the phrase could well be a quite reasonable attempt at translating the unknown Hebrew מלאכות.

Inasmuch as the Hebrew word is a biblical *hapax Legomenon*, it would not be the least bit surprising that the LXX translators would not know what to do with the word and would make a connection with the immediately preceding מלאך. Thus, rather than rightly reading the מ as a nominal pattern indicating abstraction--thus "message", they likely took it to be an irregular plural form of what is elsewhere a masculine noun- מלך.

Kutscher discusses the growing preference for the מ nominal pattern in later Hebrew in reference to a different root: "Instead of SBH ממלכה or מליכה 'kingdom', LBH prefers מלכות which is used about 30 times in Chronicles and also in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Daniel. As mentioned above (§121), the noun pattern with the derivational suffix מ- became more and more prevalent in the course of the history of BH and MH."<sup>46</sup>

Jastrow lists one other occurrence of the word מלאכות in Genesis Rabbah, s. 50 לבשו מלאכות, "they put on the appearance of angels."<sup>47</sup>

Other instances of the מ pattern in the MP are rendered properly:

Hos. 1: 4 ממלכות βασιλειαν; Hos. 4: 11 זנות πορνειαν; Hos. 6: 10 זנות πορνειαν; Amos 9: 14 שבות αιχμαλωσιαν; Obad. 20 גלגל μετοικεσias

μετοικεσια; Joel 4: 1 שבות αιχμαλωσιαν; Amos 1: 6 גלגל αιχμαλωσιαν; Amos 1: 9 גלגל αιχμαλωσιαν But these are, after all, common words.

The Greek makes no effort to represent the לאמר of "Haggai spoke saying".

το πνευμα των καταλοιπων παντος του λαου Dingermann suggests that

the *Vorlage* of the LXX must have been **וְאֶת־דָּרוֹחַ שְׁאֵרִית פֶּלֶא הָעַם** rather than that seen in the MT **וְאֶת־דָּרוֹחַ פֶּלֶא שְׁאֵרִית הָעַם**.<sup>48</sup> This is possible but far from certain.

ἐποιοῦν ἐργα The plural here renders the Hebrew singular **מְלֹאכָה**. This type of switch from the singular to the plural occurs fairly often in the MP.<sup>49</sup>

τῇ τετραδὶ καὶ εἰκαδὶ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ ἐκτοῦ τῷ δευτέρῳ εἰς ἐπὶ Δαρκείου τοῦ βασιλέως

Although this is a straight-forward enough rendering of the Hebrew, there are many questions associated with this verse which pertain to the editorial history of the book.

## Chapter 2

[τη τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος του εκτου τω δευτερω ετει επι Δαρειου του βασιλεως.]

(1) τω εβδομω μηνι μια και εικαδι του μηνος ελαλησε κυριος εν χειρι Αγγαιου του προφητου λεγων 2 Ειπον δη προς Ζοροβαβελ τον του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα και προς Ιησουν τον του Ιωσεδεκ τον ιερεα τον μεγαν και προς παντας τους καταλοιπους του λαου λεγων

Translation: [On the twenty-fourth of the sixth month in the second year of Darius the king]--in the seventh month, on the twenty-first of the month, the Lord spoke by the hand of Haggai the prophet saying, 2 Speak now to Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah and to Joshua the son of Josedek the high priest and to all the remnant of the people saying,

The double dating construction of the LXX should not be ignored or set aside casually for a number of reasons: 1. It is supported by the punctuation of the Hebrew. The : (*soph pasuq*) following verse 14 makes a clear (and ancient) break, thus separating it from the date which immediately follows. 2. An even greater (and more ancient) break is suggested by the פ ( *Petuhah*) which follows verse 14 and is observed in the margin of the text. [It is quite important to recognize that the system of paragraph division (*Pisgat*) is both ancient and independent of the punctuation.]<sup>50</sup> 3. This arrangement of the text is supported by the LXX, Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshitta and the Hebrew of the Complutensian, Antwerp, Paris and London Polyglots.<sup>51</sup> And perhaps most significantly, this arrangement is supported by the ancient Hebrew text from Wadi Murabba'at.<sup>52</sup> 4. To disconnect the first date from the second creates the anomalous situation of having no year specified in the second date. The proposed "double duty" of the phrase בשנת שנים לדריוש המלך is much less probable when the two date formulas are related to two entirely different situations. 5. If 15a specifies the date of the

preceding material, it is anomalous in being the only date in the book which does not precede the material it dates. Furthermore, it creates an awkwardness in implying that the charge of Haggai which was given on the first day of the sixth month (1: 1), received no particular response for 23 days. And this 23 day delay is necessarily related to a response described in the most emphatic terms. 6. And finally, the view that there is a textual dislocation or diverse views within the text itself concerning the important dates is perhaps supported from the unexpected date of 2: 18 "the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month."<sup>53</sup>

ελαλησε κυριος εν χειρι Αγγαιου היה דבר־יהוה ביד־חגי (Murruba'at scroll has לֹא rather than ביד.) Rudolph argues that the MT has assimilated toward the reading of 1.1. He further argues that the intermediate agency implied by ביד does not fit well with verse 2 where Haggai is directly speaking. He cites Is. 20.2 as an illustration of the intermediate agency implied by ביד.<sup>54</sup> But inasmuch as the expression "by the hand of" occurs in so many different contexts (with varying emphases on agency and instrumentality) and inasmuch as we don't know what Murruba'at had at 1.1 (where Rudolph thinks the MT reading is appropriate), it seems best to regard the two Hebrew expressions as roughly synonymous. The widespread Greek support of the MT along with the support of the other major versions make it unreasonable to overturn the MT on the basis of Murruba'at.

λαλεω renders היה דבר or היה דבר in:

III Kings 16.7 και εν χειρι Ιου υιου Ανανι ελαλησεν κυριος επι Βαασα

18.31 ως ελαλησεν κυριος προς αυτον

The similarity of the first passage is so close that one would feel quite certain that the Greek of our passage represents a rendering of

the MT.

και προς παντας τους καταλοιπους του λαου וְלִשְׁאֲרֵית הָעַם

The Syriac supports the reading of LXX. Yet, it is quite likely that this παντας represents nothing more than assimilation toward 1.14. The Targum's וְלִשְׁאֲרֵית דְּעַמָּא and the Vulgate's *ad reliquias populi* confirm the MT.<sup>55</sup> Gelston lists the plus (מל) of this verse along with eleven others which he suspects are "more likely to be due to the translators than derived from a Hebrew *Vorlage* distinct from MT."<sup>56</sup>

3 Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ὅς εἶδε τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐμπροσθεν;  
και πως υμεις βλεπετε αὐτον νυν; καθως ουχ υπαρχοντα ενωπιον υμων. 4  
και νυν κατισχυε, Ζοροβαβελ, λεγει κυριος, και κατισχυε, Ιησου ο του  
Ιωσεδεκ ο ιερεις ο μεγας, και κατισχυετω πας ο λαος της γης, λεγει  
κυριος, και ποιειτε· διοτι μεθ υμων εγω ειμι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, 5  
και το πνευμα μου εφεστηκεν εν μεσω υμων· θαρσειτε.

Translation: 3 Who among you *is there* who saw this house in its former glory? And how do you see it now--as though not existing before you? 4 And now, Be strong, Zorobabel, says the Lord, and be strong, Joshua the son of Josedek the great priest, and let all the people of the land be strong, says the Lord, and work. Because I am with you, says the Lord Almighty, 5 and my Spirit stands in your midst. Be of good cheer.

3. מִי בְכֶם הַנִּשְׁאַר אֲשֶׁר רָאָה אֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה . . .

הַנִּשְׁאַר This is the Niphal part. of the verb and means to be left over or  
 יִשְׁאַר

remaining. It at times is used technically to refer to the remnant. The

LXX's omission has every appearance of being a simple case of homoioteleuton. It is noteworthy that אֲשֶׁר immediately follows, so that the omission could have occurred easily. It is also noteworthy that the reading of the MT is supported by the Vulgate, the Peshitta, the Targums and Murruba'at.

הַנִּשְׁאָר the Niphal part. only occurs elsewhere in the MP in:

זכר

Zech. 11.9 καταλοιπα κατεσθιетωσαν εκαστος τας σαρκας του πλησιον  
αυτου

12.14 πασαι αι υπολελειμμεναι φυλαι

εν τη δοξη αυτου τη εμπροσθεν בְּכִבְדֹּדִי הָרְאֵנִי

It is quite unusual for εμπροσθεν to render הָרְאֵנִי. The only parallels are:

Judg. 20.39 as in the former (first) battle

Zech. 1.4 the former prophets

7.7 former prophets

7.12 former prophets

8.11 as in the former days

και πως υμεις βλεπετε αυτον νυν; καθως ουχ υπαρχοντα ενωπιον υμων.

וַיֹּמַר אַתֶּם רֹאִים אֹתוֹ עַתָּה הֲלֹא כְמֹהוּ בָּאֵין בְּעֵינֵיכֶם׃

וְעַתָּה הֲלֹא כְּמֹהוּ בְּעֵינֵיכֶם׃

Whereas the Hebrew indicates the interrogative twice with כֹּה and הֲ, the Greek merely carries the interrogative force from the first clause over to the second.

4 και νυν κατισχυε, Ζοροβαβελ, λεγει κυριος, και κατισχυε, Ιησου ο του  
Ιωσεδεκ ο ιερεις ο μεγας, και κατισχυετω πας ο λαος της γης, λεγει  
κυριος, και ποιειτε· διوتي μεθ υμων εγω ειμι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, 5  
και το πνευμα μου εφεστηκεν εν μεσω υμων· θαρσειτε.

The Greek of verse 4 is a very precise rendering of the Hebrew. Except for the inversion of διوتي μεθ υμων εγω / כִּי־אֲנִי אִתְּכֶם, even the word-order of the Greek follows the Hebrew.



κατισχυω renders קַח (Qal) in the MP:

Za 8.9 κατισχυεωσαν αι χειρες υμων

.13 θαρσειτε και κατισχυετε

אֶת־הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־פָּרַטִי אֲתֶכֶם בַּצֵּאתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם 5

This interesting little clause which is not included in the text of any of the major editions of the LXX has quite a lot of manuscript support.

Although there are variations among the manuscripts that include the clause, the fundamental addition is represented by: C 68 538 613 Ach Syh<sup>mg</sup> Cyr<sup>F</sup> V Sa Bo 763 22 L' 407<sup>mg</sup> 770 Arm Cyr<sup>P</sup> Tht. Bas.N.

However, it must be noted that the only major codex to include the reading is Venetus (V) which is dated 8th Century. Thus, it is very likely merely another instance of the widespread assimilation toward the Hebrew. The clause is not represented by the Old Latin.<sup>57</sup>

5 και το πνευμα μου εφεστηκεν εν μεσω υμων· θαρσειτε.

וְרוּחִי עֹמֶדֶת בְּתוֹכְכֶם אֶל־תִּירְאוּ:

יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

εφιστημι is a rather common rendering of עֹמֶד. What is a little surprising is that the participle was rendered by the Greek perfect tense. Although the aspects are quite different--continuous vs. perfective, nevertheless both forms are quite capable of referring to present time.

The Greek has stated positively with "be cheerful, be courageous" that which the Hebrew stated negatively "do not fear." This does not reflect any particular liberty because evidently the Greek phrase had become a stereotyped rendering of the Hebrew. In almost all of the occurrences of θαρσεω in the LXX, you find that it is rendering the same Hebrew you have here. This is always the case in the MP: אֶת־הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־פָּרַטִי אֲתֶכֶם בַּצֵּאתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם

Jl. 2.21,22; Zeph. 3.16\*; Zech. 8.13,15

\*Zeph. 3.16 betrays some interesting parallels to our passage.

It is a prophecy of a coming restoration when the Lord would in a special way be in the midst of His people. The Greek of Zeph. 3.14-17 is:

Χαιρε, θυγατερ Σιών, κηρυσσε, θυγατερ Ιερουσαλημ· ευφραινου και κατατερπου εξ ολης της καρδιας σου, θυγατερ Ιερουσαλημ. περιειλε κυριος τα αδικηματα σου,<sup>1</sup> λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων σου.<sup>2</sup> βασιλευς Ισραηλ κυριος εν μεσω σου, ουκ οψη κακα ουκετι.<sup>3</sup> εν τω καιρω εκεινω ερει κυριος τη Ιερουσαλημ. θαρσει, Σιών, μη παρεισθωσαν αι χειρες σου. Κυριος ο θεος σου εν σοι, δυνατος σωσει σε, επαξει επι σε ευφροσυνην και καινιει σε.<sup>4</sup> εν τη αγαπησει αυτου και ευφρανθησεται επι σε εν τερψει ως εν ημερα εορτης. [Rejoice, daughter of Zion. Proclaim, daughter of Jerusalem. Be glad and delight thyself from your whole heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord has taken away your iniquities. He has redeemed you from the hand of your enemies. The Lord, the king of Israel is in the midst of you. You shall no longer see evils. In that time, the Lord will say to Jerusalem, Be of good cheer, Zion. Do not let your hands go slack. The Lord Your God is among you--Powerful, He will save you. He shall bring gladness upon you and He shall renew you in His love and He will rejoice over you in delight as in a day of feasting.]

There are many differences between the LXX and the MT of this passage.

Several of these differences coalesce to alter dramatically the sense of the passage. 1. περιειλε κυριος τα αδικηματα σου / הסיר יהוה מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ

The Hebrew suggests that Yahweh will (futuristic perfect) remove Judah's judgments or punishments. The Greek's rendering is unique in the LXX and is clearly theologically-motivated. [Cf. verse 11 where instead of removing "those who proudly exalt themselves" עליזי גאותך, Yahweh removes "your arrogant acts of contempt" τα φανλισματα της υβρεως σου.

2. λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων σου / פנה איבך. The Greek translator apparently has read the Hebrew verb as פדה. 3. ουκ οψη κακα ουκετι / לא־תִירָאִי רָע עוֹד. The LXX has read the verb as תִּרָאִי and has with its neuter κακα read רָע as an abstraction. 4. και καινιει σε / יחַרִישׁ. The translator read the verb as some form of חַדַּשׁ ("to renew").

These changes have the unmistakeable impact of changing what in the Hebrew is a judgment of a portion of the society into a dramatic spiritual renewal where the wickedness of the whole people is removed or purged. In view of the fact that this precise theological change is also found in Malachi 3.16 and in light of the unique rendering τα ἀδικήματα σου / מַשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, it is not improbable that the apparent misreadings are in fact deliberate.

6 διότι ταῦτε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Ἐτι ἀπαξ ἐγὼ σεισῶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξῆραν· 7 καὶ συσσεισῶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, καὶ πλησῶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον δόξης, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. 8 ἐμὸν τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ ἐμὸν τὸ χρυσιόν, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. 9 διότι μεγάλη ἐστὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ οἴκου τούτου ἡ ἐσχάτη ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ· καὶ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ δώσω εἰρήνην, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχῆς εἰς περιποίησιν παντὶ τῷ κτιζόντι τοῦ ἀναστήσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον.

Translation: 6 Because thus says the Lord Almighty, Yet once *again* I will shake the heaven and the earth and the sea and the dry land. 7 And I will also shake all the nations, and the precious things of all the nations will come. And I will fill this house with glory, says the Lord Almighty. 8 The silver is mine and the gold is mine, says the Lord Almighty. 9 Because the glory of this house shall be great, the latter more than the first, says the Lord Almighty. And in this place I will give peace, says the Lord Almighty, even peace of soul for a possession for every one building to raise up this temple.

6 כִּי כֵּן אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עוֹד אַחַת מַעַט הִיא

There is, perhaps, no better assessment of the final four words of this Hebrew than that of the Meyers. They state:

*In only a moment.* (Lit. "once again, in a little while.") Some see this as a gloss. Carroll (1979b:157, 161), for example, takes it as a prophetic response to the "cognitive dissonance created by unfulfilled prophecy" whereby the expected event is pushed into the future. However, this strikes us as quite unnecessary on semantic (see below) as well as contextual grounds; rather, it can just as well

indicate the sense of urgency or immediacy perceived by the prophet in the portentous events connected with the temple rebuilding and the leadership associated with it (cf. Ackroyd 1968:153-54, especially n. 3) The prophet was sure that Yahweh would carry out great deeds; he just did not know precisely when they would occur.

The grammar of the expression is complex and requires some elucidation. The last element in the Hebrew, the fem. sing. pronoun, is presumably the copula, agreeing in gender with *'h*l. The interesting feature is that *'h*l intrudes into the familiar idiom *'ad m<sup>h</sup>'et* ("very soon"), apparently to emphasize the imminence of the time specified; see *GLC* § 141 1; 142 f,g. The uniqueness and strangeness of the term argue in favor of its originality and make it unlikely that it was added later in an attempt to bring prophecy into line with what was predicted at an earlier date. On the contrary, the expression seems to have been coined specifically to convey a sense of the nearness of the eschatological events depicted in the rest of verse 7 and in verses 8-9.<sup>58</sup>

But if the Hebrew suggests the immediacy of this great act of Yahweh, the Greek translators with the advantage of historical perspective have quite another idea about the time frame of the passage. StuhlmueLLer's assessment is acute. She states,

The statement in Hag. 2:6a, "Once again, in a little while," clearly designates an important event on the immediate horizon. The rebuilding of the temple was leading Israel quickly to the verge of an eschatological finale, a total fulfillment of promises. The ancient Greek text, however, reads differently. Changing "in a little while" to read "Yet once more," the translator shifted the emphasis from the imminent future within everyone's lifetime to a new and unknown moment in the distant future. Very possibly when the glorious finale did not quickly burst with splendor upon Israel, the Greek translator adapted the text to the necessity of waiting for still another time, "yet once more."<sup>59</sup>

εγω σεισω τον ουρανον και την γην και την θαλασσαν και την ξηραν  
ואני מרעיש את השמים ואת הארץ ואת הים ואת החרבה

The Hiphil participle has been rendered by the future of σειω. This is quite a reasonable rendering of the participle in view of the preceding

context. The same rendering of this verb (not participle) in the Hiph. occurs in Hag 2.22, Isa 14.16, Ez. 31.16.

ξηραν is a very common rendering of חרב.

7 και συσσεισω παντα τα εθνη, και ηξει τα εκλεκτα παντων των εθνων,

והרעשתי את כל־הגוים ויבאו חֲמֻדַּת כל־הגוים

The "together" idea implicit in the prefix συσ(ν) has almost completely fallen away as can be seen from Ps 28.8 and Ps 59.2 (which is rendering הרעשHi.). Thus this is another interesting example of the LXX translators having used a synonym rather than maintaining strict correspondence with Hebrew roots.

חֲמֻדַּת εκλεκτα The Hebrew word means something which is desirable  
- : v

or precious. Because of the Greek plural, the editors of BHS have

suggested that the LXX translators were reading the preferable reading

חֲמֻדִּים which means valuables or treasures. Rudolph (p. 41) has rightly

pointed out that the plural verb clearly enough indicates that the singular noun had the collective sense. Thus the suggested change of the vocalisation is "unnötig." The plural verb and the immediate context make it very clear that what is in view are various material treasures which would be used in the refurbishing of the temple. Thus, the messianic reading of the Vulgate which was popularized by the AV "and the desire of all nations shall come" is rightly abandoned.<sup>60</sup> Other instances of חֲמֻדַּת

being rendered by εκλεκτος are:

Zech. 7.14 they have made the choice land a desolation

Jer. 3.19 and I will give thee a choice land

Jer. 38(31).39 a wall of choice stones

8 εμον το αργυριον και εμον το χρυσιον, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

לִי הַכֶּסֶף וְלִי הַזָּהָב נָא יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת :

As previously mentioned, this is the only place in the MP where λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ renders anything other than אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. The Greek does an amazing job of even rendering the Hebrew word order.

9 διοτι μεγαλη εσται η δοξα του οικου τουτου η εσχατη υπερ την πρωτην, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ· και εν τω τοπω τουτω δωσω ειρηνην, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και ειρηνην ψυχης εις περιποιησιν παντι τω κτιζοντι του αναστησαι τον ναον τουτον.

גְּדוֹל יִהְיֶה כְבוֹד הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאַחֲרוֹן מִן־הָרִאשׁוֹן

The causal conjunction διοτι is not represented in the Hebrew. Surely the LXX translators have merely inferred the causal relationship between the clauses. The precise significance of the Hebrew is uncertain. "Latter" can either modify "glory" or "this house." It is likely that the LXX has read the connection with "glory" properly.

και ειρηνην ψυχης εις περιποιησιν παντι τω κτιζοντι του αναστησαι τον ναον τουτον. The phrase ειρηνην ψυχης occurs nowhere else in the LXX.

Neither does the corresponding Hebrew שָׁלֵם נַפְשׁ ever occur. For this reason it is quite difficult to determine the precise meaning of the Greek phrase. Nevertheless, it does seem quite likely that the gloss represents a psychologized or spiritualized view of "peace." Petersen's assessment is helpful. As he states,

The ambiguities inherent in the Hebrew formulation elicited reflection apparently in response to the following question: For



whom will Yahweh provide this *šalām*? Some exegete/scribe wrote an answer into the margin of the book which found its way into the Septuagint manuscripts, an answer that linked these glorious promises to the pragmatic admonitions articulated in Hag. 1. This author believed that the *šalām* would not be something of material sort, but a spiritual condition resulting from a specific activity, actual participation in the construction of the temple. What was for the original speaker a material form of prosperity has, in LXX, become a highly spiritualized concept: 'and peace of soul as a possession for all who build, to erect this temple.'<sup>61</sup>

παντι τω κτιζοντι Although κτιζω usually refers to the divine act of creation, it is an appropriate verb here for its connotations of laying a foundation, or founding a city. Cf. 1 Es. 4.53 και πασι τοις προσβαινουσιν απο της Βαβυλωνιας κτισαι την πολιν (i.e. Jerusalem)

του αναστησαι (ανιστημι) In the MP, when there is a corresponding Hebrew word in the MT, the Greek verb always renders some form of קָם.

10 Τετραδι και εικαδι του ενατου μηνος ετους δευτερου επι Δαρειου εγενετο λογος κυριου προς Αγγαιον τον προφητην λεγων 11 Ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Επερωτησον τους ιερεις νομον λεγων

Translation: 10 On the twenty-fourth *day* of the ninth month of the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came to Haggai the prophet, saying 11 Thus says the Lord Almighty, Ask the priests for a judgment saying

שאל־נא את־הכהנים תורה לאמר:

επερωταω is typically a rendering of שאל(Qal). It is quite common for it to have this type of double accusative construction (i.e. to ask someone *concerning* something). It can also have the meaning to ask someone *for* something. Both the Greek and the Hebrew allow that either the priests are being questioned concerning the Torah or they are being asked for a judgment or ruling. In view of the indefinite תורה / νομον, it is quite



probable that the sense of "judgment" is required.

12 Εαν λαβη ανθρωπος κρεας αγιον εν τω ακρω του ιματιου αυτου και αψηται το ακρον του ιματιου αυτου αρτου η εψεματος η οινου η ελαιου η παντος βρωματος, ει αγιασθησεται; και απεκριθησαν οι ιερεις και ειπαν Ου.

Translation: 12 If a man should take holy meat in the corner of his garment and the corner of his garment should touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any food, shall it be made holy? And the priests answered and said, No.

הן ישא־איש בשר־קֹדֶשׁ בכנף בגדוֹ ונגַע בכנפו אֶל־הֶלֶחֶם ואל־הַנֶּזִיד  
ואל־הַיַּיִן ואל־שֶׁמֶן ואל־כֹּל־מֵאֵכֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ ויעֲנֶה הַכֹּהֲנִים ויאָמְרוּ לֹא:

Every occurrence of the Greek κρεας represents the Hebrew בֶּשָׂר. Of course, there are a number of other renderings of בֶּשָׂר. The expression "holy meat" only occurs elsewhere in Jer. 11.15 where it is rendered κρεα αγια.

ακρος is a rendering of כַּף only in Hag 2.12 & 13. It is quite a good one. The idea of wings or extensions is nicely conveyed by corners.

ונגע בכנפו אֶל־הֶלֶחֶם In the Hebrew the man is the subject of "touch." This is made necessary by the preposition ל. But inasmuch as the preposition ל typically introduces the object of this Hebrew verb it is not certain whether you have a (previously unattested) double object construction or an instrumental ל (i.e. "should touch his skirt to the bread" or "should touch with his skirt the bread"--ל quite commonly introduces the object of the Hebrew verb as well.) In the Greek the neuter noun which could normally either be the subject or object must here be

the subject because the verb takes the genitive object. So whatever uncertainty attaches to the syntax of the Hebrew, it is clear that the Greek has switched the subject of the verb.

בִּיִּיד is a masculine noun derived from בִּיִּי which means to boil. The noun refers to "a kind of boiled leguminous food." (BDB p. 268)

εψευματος is the exact equivalent--something boiled, usually vegetables. It is the rendering of the <sup>same</sup> Hebrew <sup>word</sup> every time but once (Gen 25.30 where it seems to render אֲדָם).

הִיִּקְרִישׁ εἰ ἀγιάσθησεται The Qal imperfect with the interrog. הִי is nicely rendered by the Greek future passive.

13 και ειπεν Αγγαιος Εαν αψηται μεμιαμμενος επι ψυχη απο παντος τούτων, ει μιανθησεται; και απεκριθησαν οι ιερεις και ειπαν Μιανθησεται.

Translation: 13 And Haggai said, If someone who is defiled because of a body should touch any of these, will it be defiled? And the priests answered and said, It will be defiled.

וַיֹּאמֶר חַגִּי אִם־יִגַּע טִמְא־נֶפֶשׁ בְּכָל־אֶלֶה הִטְמֵא וַיַּעֲנוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים וַיֹּאמְרוּ יִטְמָא׃

The expression טִמְא־נֶפֶשׁ refers to being unclean by virtue of contact with a dead body. It occurs in: Nu 5.2, 9.6,7,10. However, all of these occurrences include the ל preposition attached to נֶפֶשׁ. The precise phrase occurs only elsewhere in Lev 22.4.

Nu. 5.2, 9.6,7,10 ἀκαθαρτον επι ψυχη

Lev. 22.4 ο απομμενος πασης ακαθαρσιας ψυχης

Although the cognate (Hebrew) verb in its various stems is frequently rendered by various forms of the verb מִלֵּךְ, the adjective is only so

rendered in Nu. 6.12 and in Hag. 2.14 & 15.. It is typically rendered by ακαθαρτος.

The preposition επι is making the causal relationship explicit.

The preposition απο makes no particular contribution to the clause but is merely functioning as a marker of the genitive as in Lev. 5.3, Nu. 16.26 (in the same expression).

14 και απεκριθη Αγγαιος και ειπεν Ουτως ο λαος ουτος και ουτως το εθνος τουτο ενωπιον εμου, λεγει κυριος, και ουτως παντα τα εργα των χειρων αυτων, και ος εαν εγγιση εκει, μιανθησεται ενεκεν των λημματων αυτων των ορθρινων, οδυνηθησονται απο προσωπου πονων αυτων· και εμισειτε εν πυλαις ελεγχοντας.

Translation: 14 And Haggai answered and said, Thus is this people and thus is this nation before Me, says the Lord, And thus are all the works of their hands, and whoever draws near there, he will be defiled on behalf of their former burdens, they shall be grieved because of their labors. Indeed you hated those who reproved in *the* gates.

וַיַּעַן חַגַּי וַיֹּאמֶר בֵּן הָעַם־הַזֶּה וּבֶן־הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה לִפְנֵי נְאֻם־יְהוָה

וּבֶן כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֵיהֶם וְאֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיבוּ שָׁם טָמֵא הוּא :

Rudolph follows Joüon (Bibl 1929, p. 418 f.) and reads the שם in connection with אֲשֶׁר. Thus he translates, "and wherever they enter, it is unclean." BDB (p. 1027 §1b) says, "preceded by the rel., אֲשֶׁר *where*, Gn 2.11, Ex 20.21, I S 9.10 +, usu. with one or more words between, Gn 13. 3,14; 19.27, Ex 29.42, 2 Sa 11.16, 2 Ki 23.27 + oft."

While this treatment of שם ... אֲשֶׁר is certainly possible, it is unlikely in this context. As Verhoef states, "But the point is more the defiled offering than the defiled place where they were brought."<sup>62</sup>

It is quite uncommon for εγγίζω to render the Hiphil of קָרַב . It is much

more common for it to be a rendering of the verb in the Qal. As LS (p. 467) says the Greek verb is "mostly intransitive." As such it is a strange rendering of the transitive Hiphil but an appropriate rendering of the Qal. Other instances of the verb apparently rendering the Hiphil of קָרַב include:

Gen. 12.11 *ενικα ηγγισεν . . . εισελθειν εις Αιγυπτον*

MT **בְּאִשֶּׁר הִקְרִיב לְבוֹא מִצְרַיִם** (both the Greek and the Hebrew are using the verb(s) in a specialized construction meaning "to begin")

Isa. 5.8 woe to them who *αγρον προς αγρον εγγιζοντες*

MT **שׂוֹדָה בְּשׂוֹדָה יִקְרִיבוּ** "joining field to field"

Rather than regarding the Greek *εγγιση* as evidence that the Hiphil might not be transitive in this context, it is much more reasonable to regard that choice of verb as tendentious and supporting the translator's view that the offerer is being defiled -- "and whoever draws near there".

**טָמֵא הוּא** *μιανθησεται* The Hebrew can either represent the Qal perfect

or the adjective. In either case the translation would be "it is unclean". The Greek has the future passive "he will be made unclean".

*ενεκεν των λημματος αυτων των ορθρινων, οδυνηθησονται απο προσωπου πονων αυτων και εμισειτε εν πυλαις ελεγχοντας.*

[ **יֵעַן מִשְׁאוֹתֵיהֶם בְּקֶרֶעַן מִפְּנֵי יִגְיעֵיהֶם וְשִׁנְאָתָם בְּשַׁעְרֵים מוֹכִיחַ** ]

*ενεκεν των λημματος (πλημμεληματος) αυτων των ορθρινων*

*πλημμεληματος* in Lucianic Group I--(manuscript 86) Since Wellhausen, it has been almost universally assumed that this clause represents a misreading of a Hebrew text with the word שֹׁדָה ("bribe").<sup>63</sup> Rudolph's statement is representative:

Der Schluß stammt aus Am 5,10, aber auch das Davorstehende scheint auf ein hebräisches Original zurückzugehen, denn der jetzige Anfang »wegen ihrer morgendlichen Abgaben (oder Verschuldungen)«, der grammatisch mit dem M-Schluß von V. 14 zu verbinden ist, ist sinnlos und verlangt die Änderung von על־מִשְׁאֵת שֹׁחַד in על־מִשְׁחָד »wegen der Erhebung von Bestechungsgeld« (πλημελ. scheint nur innergriechische Abänderung zu sein, gegen Ackroyd: JJSt 1956, S. 165).<sup>64</sup>

However, there is a difference between Rudolph's statement and that of Wellhausen which demonstrates the greatest difficulty in the fundamental suggestion. That difference is that Wellhausen suggested an original לקחתם שֹׁחַד. Rudolph's suggested *Varlage* rightly acknowledges that in the MP λημμα is always a rendering of the word מִשְׁחָד. Wellhausen's suggested *Varlage* represents the common Hebrew idiom for the "taking of a bribe." But either suggested *Varlage* is very problematic. One ignores a stereotypical rendering of the LXX while the other ignores the proper Hebrew idiom. It is more reasonable to question the senselessness of ορθρινων. Inasmuch as it is certain that the latter elements of the gloss derive from Amos 5, it is quite possible that the glossator is referring to that prophecy as the earlier burdens (oracles). Thus Brenton translates the Greek "because of their early burdens."<sup>65</sup> Inasmuch as the word λημμα in the MP always refers to a prophetic burden, i.e. an oracle, this is the most natural and probable meaning of the Greek. However, it should be noted that the supposed *Varlage* לַיְתָּהּ בִּקְרֹן is without analogy in the MT. The concrete associations of "morning" always are found in the Hebrew בֹּקֶר. This is not quite as true of the Greek ορθρινος (variant of ορθριος). The Greek word does at times approach the meaning of early (with no apparent associations of morning). Cf. the meaning of the comparative used as an adverb "also ορθριτερον as Adv., *earlier*" (LS p. 1250). This discrepancy between the

Greek and Hebrew might constitute a slight evidence that the gloss derives from the translator himself rather than from his *Vorlage*.

οδυνηθησονται απο προσωπου πονων αυτων

The difficulty of the text caused both ancients and moderns to emend it. πονηριων is found in place of πονων in W<sup>mg</sup> S<sup>ca</sup> L<sup>-36</sup> -407-613-770<sup>c</sup> C'-68 -239 Syh(sing.) Arm Cyr<sup>P</sup> Th. Tht.(των πον.) Hi.

No doubt Ziegler (Göttingen) and Rahlfs are correct in reading the more difficult πονων. If our reading of the previous clause is correct, then we should probably conclude that this clause is referring to the inadequacy of their previous labor toward the reconstruction of the temple. The translator betrays a partiality to the expression which is another evidence that this gloss derives from him. Compare:

Zech. 9.5 και οδυνηθησεται (ותחיל) σφοδρα "Gaza also shall be greatly pained"

Zech. 12.10 και οδυνηθησονται (והמר) οδυνην, ως επι τω πρωτοτοκω "and they shall grieve intensely, as for a firstborn son."

πονων αυτων πονος is certainly capable of carrying negative overtones-- "hard labor", "toil". Yet it can have a more neutral reference to "labor." The word occurs in the LXX of Hag. 1.11 "and all the works of your hands" in the neutral sense. It is probably best to regard this as a reference to the inadequacy of the previous work on the temple. Whereas they should have been at pains to give their all in the work on the temple, because this was not the case, they will now suffer pains or great grief over Yahweh's refusal to bless them.

και εμισειτε εν πυλαις ελεγχοντας ושנאתם בשערים מוכיח

Petersen's discussion of this clause is very good. He states,

Clearly the final clause in the LXX represents an insertion into the text based on Amos 5: 10, though in the second and not the third person as in MT and LXX of Amos 5: 10: "They hate him who reproves in the gate" (LXX, *emisesan en pylais elegchonta*). This dependence on the LXX of Amos for a gloss in the book of Haggai is suggestive of the scribal work present in the deuteroprophetic material, i.e., the insertion of one part of the canonical text as commentary into yet another part of the canon. . . . Since the dialogue with the priest and Haggai's use of that dialogue both have to do with holiness and uncleanness, the moralism present in LXX appears to be a secondary expansion. Ackroyd, (*Exile and Restoration*, 169-170) rightly sees the LXX material as an early interpretation, pushing the notion that becoming *tame*' was due to moral failure, a view lacking in MT.<sup>66</sup>

It is possible that Rudolph is correct in suggesting that the change in person indicates that the gloss is not the product of one glossator. However, it is also quite possible that a single glossator (the translator?) switched to the second person to heighten the direct and pointed applicability of Amos's previous prophetic charge.

15 και νυν θεσθε δη εις τας καρδιας υμων απο της ημερας ταυτης και υπερανω προ του θειναι λιθον επι λιθον εν τω ναω κυριου, 16 τινες ητε' οτε ενεβαλλετε εις κυσελην κριθης εικοσι σατα, και εγενετο κριθης δεκα σατα' και εισεπορευεσθε εις το υποληνιον εξαντλησαι πεντηκοντα μετρητας, και εγενοντο εικοσι. 17 επαταξα υμας εν αφορια και εν ανεμοφθορια και εν χαλαζη παντα τα εργα των χειρων υμων, και ουκ επεστρεψατε προς με, λεγει κυριος.

Translation: 15 And now consider, from this day and beyond, before *you* had put a stone on a stone in the temple of the Lord, 16 who were you? When you put into the grain bin twenty measures of barley, and there were ten measures of barley. And you entered into the press to draw out fifty measures, and there were twenty. 17 I struck you with barrenness and with blasting and all the works of your hands with hail, and you did not return to me, says the Lord.

15 ועתה שימו-נא לבבכם מן-היום הזה ומעלה must be "from this day



מִמָּרָם שׁוּם־אֶבֶן אֶל־אֶבֶן בְּחִיבֵל יְהוָה : מִחִיּוֹתָם

The expression to consider or take to heart where the preposition is affixed to heart rather than to the subject of consideration occurs in Mal. 1.1 in the Greek and Mal. 2.2 (2x) in the Greek and Hebrew and in Hag. 1.19(18) Greek and Hebrew.

וּמֵעֵלָה This Hebrew word represents the noun מֵעֵלָה (from עֵלָה) which means "the higher part" + the directive הָ. Thus is it an adverb usually meaning "above" but by extension also meaning "afterwards" as in I Sam. 16.13, 30.25 "from that day and afterwards." BDB (p. 751) lists Hag. 2.15 and 18 as instances of the meaning "from this day and upwards (i. e. and back)." However, note in the Addenda et corrigenda (p. 1125), "and onwards is more prob." KB (p. 548) lists our passage as meaning "onwards" with I Sam. 16.13.

It is quite probable that this is the correct meaning of the Hebrew. Furthermore, it is the likely meaning of the Greek υπερανω. Although it must be noted that LS (p. 1859) indicates that the word is used in the phrase εκ των υπερανω χρονων (SIG 742.58=Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger, editio tertia, Leipzig 1915-24 [Ephesus, i B.C.]) as meaning "of time, further back." It is totally unclear whether the direction of focus is derived from the context or the phrase itself. There is no other instance of υπερανω having anything but a spatial significance anywhere else in the LXX.

The precise meaning of υπερανω in this passage might be indicated by comparing it to synonymous constructions. For example:

I Sam. 16.13 απο της ημερας εκεινης και επανω

30.25 απο της ημερας εκεινης και επανω

It is clear that the meaning in these two passages must be "from that day

and forward." It is interesting to note that A and 410 have επανω in place of υπερανω in our passage in Haggai. Evidently the words are interchangeable. Most decisive with respect to the meaning of the Greek in Haggai is the parallel phrase in 2.18 απο της ημερας ταυτης και επεκεινα. επεκεινα clearly means beyond in the sense of later.

I Kingdoms 18.9 "and Saul looked suspiciously at David from that day και επεκεινα" (והלאה)

Ezek. 39.22 "and the house of Israel shall know that I am the Lord their God, from this day και επεκεινα" (והלאה)

Susanna 64 "Daniel was held in great reputation from that day και επεκεινα."

I Mac. 10.30 "from this day και επεκεινα ογ εις τον αιωνα χρονον"

προ του θειναι λιθον επι λιθον εν τω ναω κυριου

: יהוה : מטרם שום־אבן אל־אבן בהיכל יהוה The rendering of the Greek is so literal that it even maintains the infinitive.

16 τινες ητε מי הייתם The LXX evidently was translating מי הייתם The MT would likely be translated "since they were." If one were to stick with the MT, the plural suffix would probably be related to an implied days. The AV translates, "Since those days were, when one came . . ." The Targum Jonathan not only punctuates the sentence with the MT but has the equivalent מדהיותון .

οτε ενεβαλλετε εις κυψελην κριθης εικοσι σατα, και εγενετο κριθης δεκα σατα. בא אל־ערמת עשרים והיתה עשרה

The Greek reads, "When you cast into the barley bin [LS (p. 1015), "any hollow vessel: chest, box"] twenty ephahs, and there were ten." The Hebrew which includes the preceding inf. in the sentence reads, "Since

they were--i.e. the days when one came to twenty heaps and there were ten."

There is no instance in the LXX where *εμβαλλω* renders **בא**.

*κυψελην* occurs nowhere else in the LXX.

*κριθη* virtually always is a rendering of **שעורה**.

There can be little doubt that the LXX reading came about through metathesis for the plural of the two nouns look very similar **שעורים** / **עשורים**. Perhaps the *Vorlage* of the LXX had **בא אל-ערמת עשורים שעורים**. The omission of the unit of measure after "barleys" would not be in the least surprising for as GKC (§134n) states, "Certain specifications of measure, weight, or time, are commonly omitted after numerals." It gives Ru 3.15 as an illustration **שש שעורים** six (ephahs) of barley. All in all it is likely that the MT has dropped out **שעורים** because of haplography. It is of course possible that the LXX represents dittography on the part of the scribe(s) behind the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

και εισεπορευσαθε εις το υποληνιον εξαντλησαι πεντηκοντα μετρητας, και εγενοντο εικοσι. **בא אל-היקב לחשף חמשים פורה והיתה עשורים :**

It is quite odd that the LXX has apparently taken the same construction **בא אל** and rendered it transitively in the first case and intransitively in the second.

**חשף** can mean to scoop or skim a liquid (Isa 30.14).

The Greek *εξαντλεω* only occurs elsewhere in the LXX in:

Prov. 20.5 "counsel in a man's heart is deep water; but a prudent man *εξαντλησει* αυτην. Here it renders **דלה**.

The meaning of the Greek verb is to draw out water--the particular idea

of skimming off the top implied in the Hebrew is not a part of the meaning.

פורה means a wine trough. Either the word by extension came to refer to some unit of measure or because of the final ׀ on the preceding word the ׀ preposition was omitted by haplography. The word only occurs elsewhere in Isa. 63.3 "I have trodden the winepress alone"--clearly not the lower receptacle but the upper cavity.

17 καταξα υμας εν αφορια και εν ανεμοφθορια και εν χαλαζη παντα τα εργα των χειρων υμων, και ουκ επεστρεψατε προς με, λεγει κυριος.  
 הפיתי אתכם בשדפון ובירקון ובכרד את כל־מעשה ידיכם ואין־אתכם  
 אלי נאם־יהוה

πατασσω is the typical rendering of נכה (Hi.).

αφορια only occurs here in the LXX. It means "non- production, dearth, barrenness, sterility" LS (p. 292).

שדפון refers to scorching by the desert wind. It only occurs elsewhere in Dt. 28.22, I Ki. 8.37, Am. 4.9 and 2 Chron. 6.28.

ירקון usually occurs in combination with שדפון in the above-mentioned passages (always except Jer. 30.6--the only place where it is not referring to a problem with crops. There it refers to men's faces). ירקון might well be translated "mildew."

ανεμοφθορια only occurs elsewhere in Dt. 28.22 and 2 Chron. 6.28 where

it is rendering the other noun of the Hebrew twosome.

χαλαζα is the typical rendering of בָּרָד and they both mean "hail."

και ουκ επεστρεψατε προς με, λεγει κυριος.

וְאִין־תַּתְּכֶם אֵלַי נִאֻם־יְהוָה:

BHS and many commentators on the basis of LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate and the Targums change the text to וְלֹא שָׁתַתְּכֶם. This seems quite precarious in view of the fact that the Hebrew is clearly very difficult and may be idiomatic. Surely the translator was merely exercising some liberty. Furthermore, he was likely assimilating toward Amos 4.9. The expression "there is (was) nought of you with me" should likely be seen as a development of the idiomatic "what do I have to do with you?" מִה־לִּי (Judg. 11.12) which is able to employ the תָּא as well מִה־לְּתַבְּנִי (Jer. 23.28 "what has straw in common with wheat?"). The use of the negative predication rather than the interrogative probably just increases the force of the phrase. Ralph Smith's treatment is very good "you were as nothing to me." (p. 159)

18 υποταξατε δη τας καρδιας υμων απο της ημερας ταυτης και επεκεινα απο της τετραδος και εικαδος του ενατου μηνος και απο της ημερας, ης εθεμελιωθη ο ναος κυριου, θεσθε εν ταις καρδιαις υμων, 19 ει ετι επιγνωσθησεται επι της αλω και ει ετι η αμπελος και η συκη και η ροα και τα ξυλα της ελαιας τα ου φεροντα καρπον, απο της ημερας ταυτης ευλογησω.

Translation: 18 Set your hearts *to consider* from this day and beyond, from the twenty-fourth *day* of the ninth month, even from the day in which the temple of the Lord was founded--consider in your hearts 19 whether it shall yet be known *to be such* on the corn-floor and whether

the vine, and the fig tree, and the pomegranate, and the olive trees which bear no fruit *shall be so*--from this day I will bless you.

שִׁמּוֹנָא לַבְּנִים מִן־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וּמַעַלָּה מִיּוֹם עַשְׂרִים וָאַרְבַּעַה לַתְּשִׁיעִי  
לְמִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִסַּד הִכְלִיָּהוּהָ שִׁמּוֹ לַבְּנִים :

As in 2.10 the Greek μηνος represents only an implied שִׁמּוֹ .

θεμελιω renders the Pual of יָסַד in:

III Ki. 6.1; 7.10; 16.34; 2 Es. 3.6; Cant. 5.15; Zech. 8.9.

The Greek certainly has the basic meaning of "to lay a foundation" yet would be fully able to bear subtle nuances of the Hebrew verb. Thus the questions about the meaning of the Hebrew are not in any way decided by the Greek rendering.

הַעוֹד הַזֶּה בַּמְּגוּרָה וְעַד־הַגֶּפֶן וְהַתְּאֵנָה וְהַרְפֹּזִין וְעַץ הַיֵּית מִן־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֶבְרָךְ :

The Greek ει επι επιγνωσθησεται is nonsensical and likely represents a misreading of the Hebrew of הַזֶּה as הוֹדַע (the Hophal perf.). The Greek verb is frequently used to render a form of יָדַע.

מְגוּרָה only occurs here and in Joel 1.17 where it occurs in parallelism with אֲצֻדֹת storehouses. It must mean something like "barn." In Joel 1.17 מְגוּרָה in the plural is rendered by ληνοι "wine-presses."

The second και ει επι suggests that the *Vorlage* of the LXX probably had another עוֹד rather than the MT's עַד. It is probably best to emend the MT.

20 Και εγενετο λογος κυριου εκ δευτερου προς Αγγαιον τον προφητην τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος λεγων 21 Ειπον προς Ζοροβαβελ τον του Σαλαθιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα λεγων Εγω σειω τον ουρανον και την γην και

την θαλασσαν και την ξηραν 22 και καταστρεψω θρονους βασιλεων και  
 εξολεθρευσω δυναμιν βασιλεων των εθνων και καταστρεψω αρματα και  
 αναβας, και καταβησονται ιπποι και αναβηται αυτων εκαστος εν ρομφαια  
 προς τον αδελφον αυτου. 23 εν τη ημερα εκεινη, λεγει κυριος  
 παντοκρατωρ, λημφομαι σε Ζοροβαβελ τον του Σαλαθιηλ τον δουλον μου,  
 λεγει κυριος, και θησομαι σε ως σφραγίδα, διοτι σε ηρετισα, λεγει κυριος  
 παντοκρατωρ.

Translation: 20 And the Word of the Lord came a second time to Haggai  
 the prophet on the twenty-fourth *day* of the month, saying 21 Say to  
 Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah saying, I am  
 shaking the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land. 22 And I  
 will overthrow *the* thrones of kings, and I will destroy *the* power of the  
 kings of the nations and I will overthrow chariots and riders, and horses  
 and their riders will each one come down with a sword against his  
 brother. 23 In that day, says the Lord Almighty, I will take you,  
 Zorobabel, the son of Salathiel, My servant, says the Lord, and I will  
 appoint you as a seal, because I have chosen you, says the Lord Almighty.

20 אֶל־לִנְיָ LXX adds "the prophet."

21 מַרְעִיץ Hiphil Part. from verb meaning cause to quake or shake.

מַרְעִץ in the Hiphil is rendered by σειω in: Hag. 2.7(6); Isa. 14.16; Ez. 31.16.

και την θαλασσαν και την ξηραν represents an assimilation toward 2.6.

This addition is marked with an obelisk in the Syro-hexapla and is  
 missing from Venetus.

22 והפכתי כסא ממלכות והשמדתי ח'ק ממלכות הגוים

The verb הפך means to overturn or overthrow and evidently came to have  
 rather fixed associations. As Petersen states,

Many commentators have noted that much of the language in Hag. 2:22  
 is associated with important traditions or narrative contexts in the



Hebrew Bible. So, for example, the verb *hpk*, "overturn," is regularly used to describe the defeat of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19:25, 29; Isa. 13:19; Amos 4:11; Deut. 29:23). Interestingly, Jer. 20:16 uses this same verb and does not mention those cities by name: 'Let that man be like the cities which Yahweh overthrew without pity.' This development in Jer. 20:16 suggests something of a generalizing trend; it is not unlike the way in which this same verb is used in Hag. 2:22. This formulation in Haggai appears to function even more strongly as an oracle against a foreign nation or city than it does as a reference to the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition.<sup>67</sup>

The singular **סֵבַב** is properly rendered by the Greek plural for this is likely "an example of a common Hebrew idiom, the use of the singular for the plural in the construct before the plural, and translated 'thrones,' cf. GK §124, 2c."<sup>68</sup>

βασιλεων (kings) is found in the LXX rather than the expected βασιλειων (kingdoms). However there is an obvious interchange between the two words no doubt by metonymy. Thus βασιλεια can render *melek* and βασιλευς can render ממלכה Cf. Zephaniah 3.8 ממלכות / βασιλεις.

חִמּוֹ (Hi) is nicely rendered by ἐξολέθρευω inasmuch as both mean to utterly destroy or exterminate. The rendering is quite common.

קִיָּה only occurs 4 other times and then only in the expression *be + hazzeg*.

Ex. 13.3; 13.14; 13.16 χειρι κραταια

Amos 6.13(14) εν τη ισχυι

και καταστρεψω αρματα και αναβατας והפכתי מרכבה ורכביה

The Greek does not represent the pronominal suffix.

Alexandrinus includes at this point the clause και καταστρεψω πασαν την δυναμιν αυτων και καταβαλω τα ορια αυτων και ενισχυσω τους εκλεκτους μου. ("and I will overthrow all of their power, bring down their borders, and strengthen my chosen ones.") This is probably simply a verbose scribal insertion.<sup>69</sup>

και καταβησονται ιπποι και αναβησονται αυτων εκαστος εν ρομφαια προς τον αδελφον αυτου. יִרְדּוּ סוּסִים וְרִכְבֵּיהֶם אִישׁ בַּחֶבֶד אֶחָיו

The Greek has filled in the thought of the Hebrew in making the active hostility of each rider against his fellow rider more explicit by means of the preposition προς --"horses and their riders shall go down, each with a sword against his brother." This alters the force of the verb so that the verbal action is that of coming down against someone militarily. The Hebrew could mean the same thing. But it is quite possible that יִרְדּוּ refers to their descent to Sheol. There is a surprisingly widespread reading of αναβησονται among the manuscripts [A' 198 233' 407 534 544 Qc L-36 147c 770c Bo Cyr. Tht. Bas. N.] This surely represents nothing more than a widespread confusion resulting from the proximate αναβησονται.

23 The Greek of this verse follows the Hebrew very closely and predictably. The only point worthy of mention is the fact that in the important parallel passage Jer. 22.24 of which this passage is a direct reversal, the word for seal is αποσφραγισμα. In general αποσφραγισμα refers to the impression made by a seal while σφραγίς refers to the signet itself. But this is not always the case. And clearly in Jer. 22.24 the signet ring is in view.

<sup>1</sup>Lower Egyptian independent translation from the Greek made in the 4th century. See Ernst Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979), p. 96. The most extensive study of the Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets is still that of W. Grossouw, The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets: A Contribution to the Study of the Septuagint, Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica 3 (Rome: 1938).

<sup>2</sup>William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, (BAGD) A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (5th ed.), 2nd ed. of the English revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 286. Compare Nigel Turner, Syntax, Vol. III of James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 271.

<sup>3</sup>Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften Bd. II:2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1934), p. 465.

<sup>4</sup>E. Kautzsch ed., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, (GKC) 2nd ed. trans. A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 435 §134 *n*, "Certain specifications of *measure, weight, or time*, are commonly omitted after numerals" and pp. 435-6 §134 *p*, "On the omission of ׀ in all these cases see under *n* ; only in late passages is ׀ added."

<sup>5</sup>H. St. John Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, Vol. I: "Introduction, Orthography and Accidence" (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), p. 42.

<sup>6</sup>James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol I: Prolegomena, 3rd ed. with corrections and additions (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), p. 99.

<sup>7</sup>Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1979), pp. 156-190 (esp. 156-157).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. pp. 157 & 160. (There is an intervening table #17 on pp. 158-9).

<sup>9</sup>BAGD p. 880.

<sup>10</sup>A number of commentators on the Hebrew text have found special, emphatic significance in the expression עַל־יְדֵי. Among recent commentators, Petersen says, "This is an unusual way of putting the matter. Normally the word comes to ('el) the prophet rather than having the prophet act as a functioning intermediary." [David L. Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1985), p. 45.] Beuken argues that the expression is particularly typical of the Chronistic milieu. He states, "Ohne weitere Gegebenheiten können wir nicht mehr sagen, als daß es hier ein deuteronomistisch-chronistisches Element bildet." [W. A. M. Beuken, Haggai--Sacharja 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1967), p. 28.] Meyers and Meyers argue:

The rendering in Haggai is significant in its expression of prophetic instrumentality without the use of an active verb. Instead, *hayâ* ('came') expresses the verbal idea in keeping with traditional formulaic introduction to prophecy, 'the word of Yahweh (which) came to X' (cf. Hos. 1: 1; Jer. 1: 1-2; Zeph. 1: 1; etc.) Haggai uses *beyad* ('by the hand of') in place of the expected 'to' ('el), a shift which has the effect of emphasizing the instrumentality of the prophet. In Malachi this change is carried one step further and no verb at all appears: 'The word of Yahweh to Israel through Malachi' (Mal 1: 1). The use of *beyad* also heightens the authority of the prophet as Yahweh's spokesman. [Carol L Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1-8:

A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1987), p. 7.]

However, it is intrinsically improbable that an expression which in its instrumental meaning occurs  $\pm 120\times$ , could yet retain any particularly emphatic force. Perhaps a bit more likely is the view of Ralph Smith, who says:

The source or authority of the word of Haggai is indicated by the expression, "the word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet." That is, Haggai was the instrument through whom the word of Yahweh came. This construction "by the hand of . . ." is rare in the prophets. It is found only in Hag 1:1, 3; 2:1; and Mal 1:1. It is used in this sense frequently in the Pentateuch (Lev 8:36; 10:11; Num 4:37,45) and in the Deuteronomic history (Josh 14:2; Judg 3:4; 1 Kings 12:15; 16:7). The more common expression, "The word of Yahweh came *unto* (לְ)Haggai," is found in 2:10,20 and in 2:1 in the Murabba'at scroll. No distinction should be made between the two expressions." [Ralph L. Smith, Micah-Malachi, Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 32, (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984) p. 152.]

Baldwin plausibly suggests that, "In this sentence the less usual preposition may have been used to avoid repetition of the word 'to'". [Joyce G. Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972), p. 38.]

<sup>11</sup>Philippus Edvardus Pusey ed., Cyritli: Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas, vol. II (Oxonii: 1868), p. 244.

<sup>12</sup>J. W. Wevers, "Translation and Canonicity: A Study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus" in SCRIPTA SIGNA VOCIS: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East, presented to J. H. Hespers by his pupils, colleagues and friends. Eds. H. L. J. Vanstiphout, K. Jongeling, F. Leemhuis and G. J. Reinink (Groningen, The Netherlands: Egbert Forsten, 1986), pp. 295-6.

<sup>13</sup>Hans Walter Wolff, Haggai: A Commentary, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House: 1988), p. 29 f.n. #1b.

<sup>14</sup>Gerhard Von Rad, Old Testament Theology: Volume Two, trans. D. M. G. Stalker from the German Theologie des Alten Testaments II, Munich

1960, (English first published in 1965), p. 285.

<sup>15</sup>D. Winton Thomas, "The Book of Haggai," The Interpreter's Bible in Twelve Volumes, vol. VI (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 1041.

<sup>16</sup>Peter Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought in the Sixth Century B.C. (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 155. On the poetic structure of the book, see G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament (London: 1970), p. 458.

<sup>17</sup>Rudolph, p. 29.

<sup>18</sup>One finds an exceptional discussion of מָבֹרַח and a fine explanation of its eschatological significance in the Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: 1977, (Eng. trans. of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament, Stuttgart: 1972, 1973), Vol. II, pp. 20-49 (art. by Horst Dietrich Preuss). See esp. 47-9 and the discussion concerning the concept in the post-exilic period.

<sup>19</sup>J. Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven, De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton (Leiden: 1887), p. 78.

<sup>20</sup>GKC, p. 438 §135d.

<sup>21</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and others, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 967.

<sup>22</sup>E. A. Barber ed., (with the assistance of P. Maas, M. Scheller and M. L. West) Greek-English Lexicon: A Supplement (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 85.

<sup>23</sup>Winton Thomas, p. 1041 (cf. Ackroyd p. 155).

<sup>24</sup>Petersen, p. 48.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*



<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>27</sup>The five occurrences of the expression outside the LXX are found in Athanasius's *Epistulae Quattuor ad Serapionem* 26.541.17-18, 26.601.35 & 26.633.1 and in Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Commentaria in Psalmos* 23.428.27 & 23.597.18-19. The three occurrences in Athanasius are exact quotations from Zechariah 7.12 τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἐταξάν ἀπειθῆ τοῦ μὴ εἰσακουεῖν and as such are not worthy of comment. The two occurrences in Eusebius are a bit more interesting for in both of them he is quoting Symmachus: [In ref. to Psalm 47.14 and instead of LXX's θεσθε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν] Ταξάτε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς, καὶ καταδιέλθε τὰς βαρεῖς αὐτῆς· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Συμμάχον· Ταξάτε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν περιβόλον αὐτῆς· ("consider her power, and observe her palaces, according to Symmachus, consider her circumference") and again [In ref. to Psalm 61.11 and instead of LXX's προστιθεσθε καρδίαν] θαυμαστῶς δὲ τῷ τῆς ροῆς ὀνόματι κεχρηταί, "Πλούτος ἐὰν ῥεῇ," φήσας· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Συμμάχον· "Πλούτος, φησὶν, ἐὰν καρποφόρη, μὴ τάσσετε τὴν καρδίαν." Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τίνα δὲ τάσσειν τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τίνι προστιθεσθαι, εἰρηται πολλάκις ἐν τῷ, "Οὐχὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑποταγησεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου;" ("But wondrously in the saying of the flowing it is proclaimed, 'If riches should flow in,' according to Symmachus, 'Riches,' he says, 'if it should bear fruit, do not set your heart *upon it*, but set your heart upon this and give your attention to that is often stated in the *psalm which begins*--Shall not my soul be subject to God?")

<sup>28</sup>Thackeray, pp. 47-50.

<sup>29</sup>Budde, Karl, "Zum Text der drei letzten Kleinen Propheten," ZAW 1906, p. 11. and W. Nowack p. 887 in Rudolph Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, (J. C. Hinrichs: Lipsiae, 1906).

<sup>30</sup>J. M. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 52.

<sup>31</sup>F. Dingermann, "Massora-LXX der kleinen Propheten. Eine text-kritische Studie," (Diss. Würzburg 1948), p. 194.

<sup>32</sup>Stekhoven, pp. 77-8.



<sup>33</sup>GKC p. 460 §144g, p. 387-8 §121 fn. 1 and Ronald J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), p. 29 §160.

<sup>34</sup>Leslie Allen lists this passage (along with 6: 9-12; 7: 11,12) as an instance in which "MT appears to have lost the thread of the original meaning." (p. 253)

<sup>35</sup>Cyril of Alexandria, in a remarkable spiritual reading of the passage in the LXX, sees inattentiveness to the external aspects of the Christian religion to be a sure source of inner spiritual impotence and a certain cause of future torments. Even the most mystical and potent aspects of Christian experience--the sacramental, can be robbed of all dynamic force (Pusey, vol. II, pp. 255-6):

Ουκουν τοις οκνουσιν αποπληρουν τα εις δοξαν Θεου, και τα δι ων αν ορωτο συνεστηκως ο οικος αυτου, τουτεστιν η Εκκλησια, ουτ αν δροσος γενοιτο πνευματικος, τουτεστι παρακλησις η εξ ουρανου ψυχας και καρδιας καταπαινουσα· ουτε μην η απο γης ευκαρπια, τουτεστι, τα δια σωματος κατορθωματα· ου σιτος, ουκ οινος, ουκ ελαιου χρησις. ανισχυες γαρ παντη τε και παντως εσονται, και του κατευφραινεσθαι μακραν, καταπιανθειεν δ αν ουδαμως ελαιω τω νοητω τω της αγαλλιασεως, και απαξ απλως αγευστοι και αμετοχοι της ευλογιας απομενουσι της δια Χριστου· και προς γε δη τουτοις υπενεχθησονται τη ρομφαια, και αμισθον παντελως υπομενουσι πονον, καν ει τις αυτοις επιεικειας επιτηδευοιτο τροπος. ["Therefore, for those hesitating to complete those things which pertain to the glory of God and the things through which his house is seen fitted together--that is the church, may there not be spiritual dew, which is that exhortation which fattens both the soul and heart. Neither the fruitfulness from the earth, that is the virtuous deeds done through the body--neither grain nor wine nor the use of oil. For they will be entirely powerless and far from *able* to be made glad, in no wise *able* to be fattened with the intellectual oil of exultation. And those having absolutely no taste or share in the blessing of Christ, will remain behind. And beyond these things, they will be subjected to the sword and they will await hard labour, entirely without reward, even if any manner of goodness should be practiced among them."]

The sacramental significance of the oil is perhaps clarified in the reading of Codex Vaticanus 587, which in place of ελαιου χρησις has ελαιου χρισις.

Yet, in view of Cyril's view of the dew, the use of κατορθωμα in Patristic Greek [G. W. H. Lampe's A Greek Patristic Lexicon (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 735-736], and the importance of wine, bread and oil in early Christian thought, there can be little doubt concerning his point.

<sup>36</sup>Petersen, p. 52.

<sup>37</sup>Rudolph, p. 30.

<sup>38</sup>Meyers, p. 423. "A nearly identical pair of clauses appears in Hag 1: 10, in the negative and in the opposite order, in reference to past conditions: the heavens withheld the dew so that the earth limited its yield."

<sup>39</sup>Rudolph, p. 143. Jerome stated, "LXX ad futurum tempus omnia retulerunt, sed melius ad praeteritum, ut in Hebraico habetur."

<sup>40</sup>A.B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), pp. 77-8, §51 Rem. 6.

<sup>41</sup>GKC p. 133 §49 2a.

<sup>42</sup>Thomas O. Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), pp. XX-XXI §6. He states, "Whenever a long vowel (a e o) occurs before a guttural or r and corresponds formally to a short vowel before a doubled non-guttural, the vowel is said to be long by *compensatory lengthening*, i.e. to compensate for the non-doubling of the guttural. When a short vowel (a i u o) occurs before a guttural in similar situations, the guttural is said to be *virtually doubled*."

<sup>43</sup>Both Cyril and Theodore read verse 10 with the past tense. Interestingly, Cyril is aware that the Hebrew and Greek disagree. For he introduces his commentary on the verse with the following (Pusey, Vol II, p. 389):

Η των Εβραιων εκδοσις ουχ ως επι μελλοντος καιρου ποιειται τους λογους, χρονον δε τιθησι τον παρωχηκοτα. προ γαρ των ημερων εκεινων φησιν ο μισθος των ανθρωπων ουκ ην εις ονησιν και ο μισθος των κτηνων ουχ υπηρχε· και παλιν Τω εκπορευομενω και τω

εισπορευομενω ουκ ην ειρηνη, και αντι του φαναι Και εξαποστελω παντας τους ανθρωπους, τεθεικασι το Εξαπεστειλα παντας τους ανθρωπους. εχει δε και σφοδρα το εικος ο λογος, το δε ατρεκες εν τούτοις παραστήσει των διηγηματων η δυναμις. [The version of the Hebrews does not treat the words as dealing with a future time, but puts it in reference to time-past. "For before those days," he says, "the reward of men was not unto profit and there was no reward for the beasts." And again, "There was no peace for the one going out and the one going in," and in place of the written "I will send forth all the men," it has put "I sent all the men." The version (Hebrew) has the greater probability, and the interpretation of the narratives will concern itself precisely with these *words*.]

<sup>44</sup>Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (BDB) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 430-431.

<sup>45</sup>Dingermann, p. 195.

<sup>46</sup>Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, A History of the Hebrew Language, ed. by Raphael Kutscher (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984), p. 84 §123. See also Lazar Gulkowitsch, Die Bildung von Abstraktbegriffen in der hebräischen Sprachgeschichte (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1931), p. 43.

<sup>47</sup>Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (Philadelphia: 1903), p. 786.

<sup>48</sup>Dingermann, p. 195.

<sup>49</sup>Stekhoven, pp. 75-76.

<sup>50</sup>Israel Yeivin, Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah, translated and edited by E. J. Revell, (Scholars Press: 1980). Yeivin states:

The marking of *pisqot* is old. It is mentioned in the halakic midrashim (about 3rd cent. CE) 'Why were the *pisqot* introduced? To give Moses time to reflect between each *parashah*, and between each subject.' (*Sifra*, Leviticus 1:1, ed. Finkelstein p. 6) 'If a *petuhah* is written instead of a *setumah*, or a *setumah* instead of a *petuhah*, the scroll should be removed from liturgical use' (*Sifre* in Deuteronomy, sect. 36).

A division between different subjects is marked by a space in the non-Biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea. The same method is used in the Biblical scrolls. In some of these, such as the complete Isaiah scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) the divisions do not correspond closely to the received tradition, but in others, such as the scroll of the twelve prophets from Murabba'at (Mur XII) the correspondence is very close. The *pisqah* seem also to have been marked in early (Jewish) MSS of the Greek translation, showing that they were already a well-established feature of the text before the turn of the era. (pp. 41-2)

And on the independence of the punctuation and paragraph systems he states, "Verse division does not always coincide with the earlier *pisqah* division, so that occasionally a *pisqah* division occurs within a verse, forming the so-called *pisqah be-emsā' pasuq*, on which there are comments in the Masorah." (pp. 42-3)

W. E. Barnes, in his *Haggai and Zechariah*, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, (Cambridge: 1917), p. 10 states,

As printed in R.V. and in most editions of A.V. this date belongs to the event described in v. 14, the commencement of the work of Temple-building. The Hebrew text however has a full stop (*saph pasuk*) at the end of v. 14, and careful editions (e.g. Ginsburg's of 1910) show a division of paragraphs between vv. 14 and 15. This treatment is no doubt intended to mark the verse as giving an erroneous date for the resumption of work on the Temple. The true date (*ninth* month) is preserved in ch. ii.10.

<sup>51</sup>Smith, J. M. P., p. 57.

<sup>52</sup>P. Benoit, O.P., J. T. Milik, et R. De Vaux, O.P., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, II, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 203. The layout of the text (minus the diacritical markings of the editors) is:

[מלאכה בבית יהוה] צבאו[ת] [אלהיהם]	10
( ביום עשרים ) <i>vacat</i> ]	
( )	
( וארבעה ) ב[שנת	
שנים לד[רי]וש[הנ]לך ב[שביעי] בע[ש]רים	
ואחד לחדש [הי]ד[בר] יהוה אל חגי הנביא	15

It is quite clear that the text has a major break before the date formula and then is defaced below that point. Thus it is difficult to follow the short note on p. 205 where the editors state, "XXII 11-13: Agg1 <sup>15</sup>. Une grande partie de la l. 11, l. 12 toute entière et le début de la l. 13 n'étaient probablement pas inscrits à cause de la surface défectueuse de

la peau, qui ne prenait pas l'encre; cf. note a X 21 dans la liste des variantes, p. 183, et *passim* dans le texte, ou les blancs de ce genre sont marqués par les parentheses, ( )." Unless the editors suspected a major addition on the part of Mur. in line 11, it is quite misleading to include the parentheses on the line or to suggest that the situation in respect to line 11 which is missing nothing in comparison to the MT and all the ancient versions is comparable to lines 12 and 13 where text is clearly missing. There is surely nothing missing between the **אלהי[הם]** of line 10 and the **ביום עשר[ים]** of line 11. Although it is no doubt the case as the editors reported that the surface of a portion of line 11 was rubbed bare, the bit of line 11 rubbed bare must have been a gap representing once more the ancient separation of the date from the preceding material.

<sup>53</sup>It would run far wide of our purpose to interact with all the various theories about the compositional history of the Hebrew text, but it is perhaps not inappropriate to quote the very nice summary of Childs:

The difficulty of following the logic of the latter half of ch. 2 (vv. 15-19) has long been felt (cf. A. Köhler). Both the shift in tone and the peculiarities of the chronology seemed puzzling. At first the suggested corrections involved only the removal of a few phrases (Wellhausen, Marti), or a reinterpretation of the Hebrew syntax in order to by-pass the problems (Keil, van Hoonacker). Later a more ambitious attempt toward resolving the difficulties was made by E. Sellin (*Studien* II, 50ff.) He argued that the date formula in 1.15a represented a fragment from a passage which had been lost. Since 1.12ff. spoke of the beginning of the work on rebuilding the temple, and 2.1ff. already described the building as well under way some seven weeks later, Sellin reasoned that the report of the laying of the foundation stone must have occurred in between these two passages. He concluded that the passage in Haggai had been suppressed because the dating of the laying of the foundation stone conflicted with the Chronicler's report (Ezra 3.8ff.).

Sellin's suggestion was next picked up by Rothstein (53ff.) who argued that Sellin's lost passage was actually preserved in 2.15-19 and that, when joined to 1.15a, it formed the missing oracle.

Rothstein adduced a variety of literary and historical proofs for supporting his case that the present unit, 2.10-19, was an artificial construct of two totally different passages. With slight variation (e.g. Mitchell, Horst, Elliger) Rothstein's reconstruction of the original setting of two separate passages has been widely accepted (cf. Wolff, Hesse, von Rad, *OT Theology* II, 282-5). Brevard Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia:



Fortress Press, 1979), pp. 464-5.

R. K. Harrison sees a possible textual disruption with respect to 1.15a and 2.18. He states:

It may well be, as Stafford Wright has suggested, that the revival of enthusiasm had been marked by a fresh foundation ceremony (Hag. 2: 18; cf. Ez. 3: 10), since it was by no means unusual to have more than one foundation ritual for dwelling-houses and temples alike. The date given in Haggai 2: 18 may perhaps be a scribal error that has confused the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month (Hag. 1: 15) with the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, when the prophecy was uttered (Hag. 2: 10). . . . There may be some possibility of textual dislocation, as in Haggai 2: 15-19, which may have arisen from the confusion of dates in Haggai 1: 15 and 2: 18.

Introduction to the Old Testament with a Comprehensive Review of Old Testament Studies and a Special Supplement on the Apocrypha (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), p. 946 & 947.

<sup>54</sup>Rudolph, p. 40 f.n. 1a.

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Wolff p. 70 f.n. 2c.

<sup>56</sup>Gelston, p. 135. Note also his comment on p. 173: "The addition of  $\pi\alpha\sigma\omega\nu$ /  $\text{حلمه}$  in Am vi 2 is an expansion similar to those at Hg ii 2 and Sa xiv 17 noted on p. 135 *supra*, and differs from them only in that it appears to be reflected also in V."

<sup>57</sup>There are two important internal considerations which suggest that the clause is a later gloss:

1. The phrase to cut a word is anomalous--it does not occur anywhere else. However, it must be said that you have a similarly anomalous phrase in Neh 10: 1 כרת אִמְנָה "to make an agreement" which might suggest that in LBH you have a movement away from the more stereotyped phrase (to cut a covenant) toward more diverse expressions.
2. The clause breaks up the passage--the thought, the formula, the chiasm.

a. It is clear that the clause does not fit nicely between the two statements--"I am with you" and "My Spirit abides among you." The disruptive nature of the clause is further indicated by the difficulty of

explaining the precise syntactical function of the  $\Pi\aleph$ .

b. Fishbane argues persuasively that the duo "I am with you" and "My spirit is with you" represent a stereotyped formula typical in commission scenarios. Michael Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1985), p. 48.

c. Fishbane further argues that a chiastic pattern (be strong; I am with you) / / (My Spirit is with you; do not fear) is disrupted by the clause. [The correspondency of be strong and do not fear is argued on the grounds that they are "often used as a hendiadys in commands to individuals to embark on a new and dangerous task."] (ibid.)

<sup>58</sup>Meyers, p. 52.

<sup>59</sup>Carroll Stuhlmueller, Rebuilding with Hope: A Commentary on the Books of Haggai and Zechariah, International Theological Commentary, ed. Fredrick Carlson Holmgren and George A. F. Knight (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988), p. 26.

<sup>60</sup>See esp. Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol. I, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), p. 295 and Wolff, p. 81.

<sup>61</sup>Petersen, p. 70.

<sup>62</sup>Verhoef, p. 110 f. n. # 4.

<sup>63</sup>Wellhausen, p. 170.

<sup>64</sup>Rudolph, p. 45.

<sup>65</sup>Lancelot C. L. Brenton, The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publ. House, 1851), p. 1114.

<sup>66</sup>Petersen, p. 71.

<sup>67</sup>Petersen, p. 99.

<sup>68</sup>Smith, J. M. P., p. 77.



<sup>69</sup>So concludes K. A. Vollers, in Das Dodekapropheton Der Alexandriner: Erste Hälfte: Naûm, Ambakûm, Sophonias, Angaios, Zacharias, Malachias (Berlin: Mayer and Mueller, 1880), p. 51 "και καταστρεψω την δυναμιν αυτων και καταβαλω τα ορια αυτων και ενισχυσω τους εκλεκτους μου ist zu breit und nichtssagend, als dass er einer Vorlage entsprechen könnte."

CHAPTER FOUR  
Commentary

ΜΑΛΑΧΙΑΣ

Chapter I

1 Λημμα λόγου κυριου επι τον Ισραηλ εν χειρι αγγελου αυτου· θεσθε δη επι τας καρδιας υμων.

2 Ηγαπησα υμας, λεγει κυριος, και ειπατε Εν τινι ηγαπησας ημας; ουκ αδελφος ην Ησαυ τω Ιακωβ; λεγει κυριος· και ηγαπησα τον Ιακωβ, 3 τον δε Ησαυ εμισησα και εταξα τα ορια (ορη ?) αυτου εις αφανισμον και την κληρονομιαν αυτου εις δοματα ερημου. 4 διοτι ερει η Ιδουμια Κατεστραπτai, και επιστρεψωμεν και ανοικοδομησωμεν τας ερημους· ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Αυτοι οικοδομησουσι, και εγω καταστρεψω· και επικληθησεται αυτοις ορια ανομιας και λαος εφ'ον παρατετακται κυριος εως αιωνος. 5 και οι οφθαλμοι υμων οφονται, και υμεις ερειτε Εμεγαλυνθη κυριος υπερανω των οριων του Ισραηλ.

Translation: 1 The burden of the word of the Lord against Israel by the hand of His messenger, lay it to your hearts!

2 I have loved you, says the Lord. And you said, in what way have You loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother, says the Lord? And Jacob I loved 3 but Esau I hated. And I appointed his borders [mountains ?] for annihilation and made his inheritance unto gifts of the desert. 4 Because Idumea will say, It is overthrown, and yet let us return and build up the desolate places. Thus says the Lord Almighty, They will build but I will cast down. And they shall be called the borders of lawlessness and a people against whom the Lord has set Himself forever. 5 And your eyes will see and you will say, The Lord is magnified above the borders of Israel.

ΜΑΛΑΧΙΑΣ Although there is a considerable amount of minor variation about the precise form of the superscription, the form of the title is relatively consistent in attaching the abbreviated form of the divine name to the noun *mal'akh*. The *ias* form is the Greek representation of the

shortened Hebrew form מַלְאֲכִי. Thus, this form probably means "messenger of Yahweh." It is possible although unlikely that the Hebrew form מַלְאֲכִי represents a mere variation for מַלְאֲכִיָּה.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that the translator thought it unlikely that anyone would name their child "My Messenger" and chose to ignore an inherited vocalization and to treat the final י as representing the divine name.

Λημμα λογου κυριου επι τον Ισραηλ מִשְׁאֲדָבֶר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִשְׂרָאֵל  
 το λημμα LS says "in LXX, *burden* laid on one, *commission* received, esp. of *prophecy*, Na. 1:1, Je. 23:33 al. even λημμα ιδειν Hb. 1:1 cf. La. 2:14." It is possible that the strengthened preposition επι merely represents assimilation to the more standard formula of Zech. 12.1 מִשְׁאֲדָבֶר־יְהוָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל. However, there can be little doubt that the translator of the MP is fully capable of using his historical/theological vantage point from which to frame the text in language which is more emphatic than the Hebrew in front of him. A bold reinterpretation of the tone, perhaps content, of the prophets is found in LXX Zech. 1.4 και μη γινεσθε καθως οι πατερες υμων, ος ενεκαλεσαν αυτοις οι προφηται οι εμπροσθεν λεγοντες It cannot be without significance that this is the only instance of this Greek verb rendering the Hebrew נָקַל in the entire LXX. This verb occurs elsewhere only in:  
 Ex. 22.9 (8) και πασης απωλειας της εγκαλουμενης "and every loss charged" The context is explicitly legal. (Rendering נִמְנֵם)  
 Pr. 19.5 ο εγκαλων αδικως Parallelism equates the expression with the preceding μαρτυς ψευδης. It renders the Hebrew וְיִפְיֵחַ בְּזוּבִים technical expression for a false witness (in a legal context).  
 Wis. 12.12 For who shall withstand thy judgment or who shall accuse thee for the nations that perish? τις δε εγκαλεσει σοι κατα εθνων απολωλοτων  
 Si. 46.19 and before his eternal sleep he charged before the Lord and

Christ, I have not taken any man's goods, so much as a sandal: and no man did accuse him (και ουκ ενεκαλεσεν αυτω ανθρωπος.)

II Ma. 6.21 (A') This would represent a weakened, non-technical use of the verb inasmuch as it replaces the more widely read παρακαλω except that it appears to be a scribal error of sight based on the similarity of the following word. The text is παρακαλουν (ενεκαλουν) ενεγκαντα κρεα "they were encouraging him to use meat brought *by him*"

Thus there is no likely example of the verb having other than a technical legal or criminal nuance in the LXX. This accords with the opinion of the lexicons. BAGD (p. 215) says "Legal t.t. *accuse, bring charges against someone*." MM (p. 179) states, "For ε which was early specialized *in malam partem*, calling in a man to accuse him, and hence 'bring a charge against.'" All things considered, it seems very likely that the translator of the MP has made an emphatic semantic contribution to the Zechariah passage and a deliberate albeit subtle contribution in Mal. 1.1.<sup>2</sup>

εν χειρι αγγελου αυτου / בִּיד מַלְאֲכִי The Greek manuscripts are very

consistent in reading with αγγελου αυτου (as do Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian). 86<sup>mg</sup> (Rom. ix-x) has εν χειρι μαλαχιου. Venetus omits the αυτου. The Targum follows the MT but adds to it "whose name was Ezra the Scribe" (מַלְאֲכִי דִּיתְקַרִי שְׁמִיָּה עֶזְרָא סֹפֵרָא). The Babylonian Talmud (Megilla 15a) and Jerome share this tradition.

Although if the text were slavishly literal one might expect an original *Vorlage* of מַלְאֲכִי, it is more likely that the translator was smoothing his text a bit. As Rudolph states, "Das bedeutet nicht, daß LXX in seiner hebräischen Vorlage מַלְאֲכִי las, sondern er glied aus stilistischen Gründen מַלְאֲכִי an den Anfang der Überschrift an, wo von Jahwe in der 3. Person die Rede ist."<sup>3</sup>

θεσθε δη επι τας καρδιας υμων. This little gloss could well derive from the translator's reminiscence of Hag. 2. 15 & 18. It is, however, equally likely that the translator borrowed the phrase from Mal. 2.2. Sellin (Komm. p. 540) sees the gloss as an expression of the zeal with which the

passage was read in the synagogue (a refrain of admonition). Bachmann's unusual view that **וְשִׁמּוֹ כָּלֵב** was originally **וְשִׁמּוֹ כָּלֵב** ("and his name is Caleb"), thus an explicit identification of the unknown prophet, is entertaining but hardly likely. J. M. P. Smith's rebuttal stands:

Bach. finds in this gloss from LXX the otherwise unknown name of the prophet, by supposing LXX to represent **וְשִׁמּוֹ כָּלֵב**, the original of

which was **וְשִׁמּוֹ כָּלֵב**. But **וְשִׁמּוֹ כָּלֵב** is not good Hebrew, which would

require either **עַל לֵב**, or **וְשִׁמּוֹ לֵב עַל** as in Hg. 2<sup>15</sup>.<sup>4</sup>

3 και εταξα τα ορια (ορη ?) αυτου εις αφανισμον και την κληρονομιαν αυτου εις δοματα ερημου. **וְאֲשִׁים אֶת-הָרִיו שְׂמִמָּה** Ziegler has judged

ορια which is the attested reading to be an early scribal error. If he is correct, this is a pointed reminder that agreement with the MT need not signify late assimilation. However, Stekhoven makes the interesting suggestion that the LXX translator(s) deliberately chose a Greek word which phonologically resembled the Hebrew word. Obviously the rough breathing of ὄρια would be phonologically closer to the Hebrew than ὄρη.

He states, "Soms tijds kiest hij een minder juist woord om een Hebreeuwsch woord van ongeveer *gelijke klank* weer te geven." He gives numerous other examples from the MP.<sup>5</sup> However, it must be remembered how difficult it is to prove homoiophony and it does seem quite likely that the translator might have assimilated to verses 4 (ορια) and 5 (οριων).<sup>6</sup>

εις δοματα ερημου. **לְתַנּוֹת מִדְּבָר**

Both the Hebrew and the Greek here are difficult. Verhoef both provides a helpful assessment of the recent treatments of the Hebrew and repeats a very common misjudgment concerning the Greek. He states:

Since Capellus most scholars emended the Heb. *l'annôt*, "for the jackals," to *lin'wâṭ*, a shortened form of *lin'âṭ*, from the root *naww* or *na'â*, meaning "pastures" (of the wilderness). This rendering seems to be substantiated by the rendering of the LXX: εἰς δόματα, "to habitations," a reading supported by the Peshitta and the Syro-Hexapla. It is also supported by scriptural evidence, where reference is made to "desert pastures" in a context of judgment (cf. Jer. 9:9 [Eng. 10]; 23:10; Joel 1:19,20; 2:20; Ps. 65:13 [Eng. 12]). The main reason for this proposed emendation is that a feminine plural of the Hebrew word *tan*, "jackal," is unknown. But the ending -ôt originally was just another plural ending, without the definite distinction in gender. The expression 'jackals of the desert' is well attested to denote the effect of the divine judgment (cf. Isa. 35:7; Jer. 9:11 [Eng. 12]; 10:22; 49:33; 51:37; Ps. 44:20 [Eng. 19]; Job 30:29).<sup>7</sup>

Concerning the Greek, there are a number of points of interest. While it is true that δόμα can represent a variant spelling of the word δώμα, it is very unlikely that this is the case in this instance.<sup>8</sup> First, it should be noted that δώμα is the stereotypical rendering of the Hebrew word *lāl*. There is no instance of δώμα rendering any Hebrew word for "pasture." And just as *lāl* is a technical term meaning the roof of a palace, tower or a place of cult, in the LXX δώμα has acquired the same specific associations. Thus there are no grounds for the often repeated view that "the LXX here reads εἰς δόματα which is the equivalent of לְנוֹת (ל) for 'pastures' or 'dwelling places of.'"<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it is quite interesting to note that a number of the Hebrew words apparently rendered by the Greek word δόμα have the Hebrew letters נ ת as in the MT's לְנוֹת [מתן אתנן] [תניפה נתן מתנה]. Thus it is very likely that the translator was confused by the unexpected feminine plural ending and decided that the form was somehow related to the Hebrew verb "to give" נתן. Dingermann (p. 227) posits an LXX *Variante* reading of בְּתוֹת. A similar form occurs in Num. 3.9 and is rendered by δόμα (נתונים נתונים המה לו) = δόμα δεδομένοι οὗτοι μοι

εισι) Aquila translates the Hebrew with σ(ε)ιρηνας "the Sirens" which is a rendering for חַיָּית in Job 30.29, Is. 34.13 and 43.20 in LXX. Symmachus, Theodotion, 86 and Syh represent ανεπιβατα, an adjective meaning "not to be climbed or inaccessible" (LS 133). Interestingly, Symmachus also uses ανεπιβατα to render חַיָּית in Jer. 9.11. W. E. Barnes, in his brief little commentary, has described the sense of the LXX very accurately: "LXX ends the verse, εις δοματα ερημου, as though the sense were, 'I will appoint his heritage to be gifts to the wilderness,' i.e. to become wilderness-land."<sup>10</sup> It would also be possible to understand ερημου to be an attributive genitive in which case the translation would be "I made his heritage unto desolate (or barren) gifts."

Both the Hebrew וְאֵשִׁים and the Greek και εταξα represent a semantic zeugma, for the verbs are doing double-duty with a different nuance in the two clauses (appoint to // make).<sup>11</sup> Glazier-McDonald rightly criticizes Torrey's view of the impossibility of such a construction. As she states:

However, usage should not be anticipated, but should be defined on the basis of context. In this case, the lamed before תָּנֹת presages a change in meaning, a further qualification of the verb that translates "to turn into" into "to turn over to" (i.e., "to give to"). Such an interpretation is doubly beneficial: it requires no textual emendation and it clearly expresses the destructive sentiment of the verse--"I turned his mountains into a waste and his inheritance over to the jackals of the wilderness."<sup>12</sup>

4 διουτι ερει η Ιδουμια Κατεστραπται, και επιστρεψωμεν και ανοικοδομησωμεν τας ερημους· ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Αυτοι οικοδομησουσι, και εγω καταστρεψω·  
כִּי־תֹאמַר אֲדוֹם רָשָׁנוּ וּנְשׁוּב וּנְבִנָה חֲרֻבֹת  
כִּי־אִמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת הִמָּה יִכְנֹוּ וְאֲנִי אֶהְרֹם

The LXX can be translated either "because someone will say, 'Edom is overthrown'" or it can read "because Edom will say, 'it is overthrown'"



The Hebrew is quite unambiguous with its "because Edom will say, 'We are crushed.'" Swete capitalizes his text so as to support the first reading (διότι ἐπεὶ ἡ Ἰδουμαία κατεστραπται) while Rahlfs and Ziegler support the second. In support of the first reading is the fact that if Edom were speaking one would expect the translator to maintain the direct discourse with the first person form of the second verb (as in the MT רָשָׁנוּ). And inasmuch as אֱדוֹם is usually masculine, the translator might have been hesitant to link אֱדוֹם and תֹּאמַר (which is feminine). Indeed, he might have read תֹּאמַר as the 2nd masc. sing. functioning as an indefinite (Cf. GKC §144 א). In support of the second reading is the fact that if indeed the subject of ἐπεὶ were indefinite, one would surely expect the indefinite pronoun τις. Perhaps, in view of the rarity of the 2nd masc. sing. functioning as an indefinite, this observation is decisive. In view of the discrepancy in gender and the abrupt shift of person in the Hebrew, the LXX translator just reworked the text.

Concerning the semantical shift from רָשָׁה ("to batter down") to καταστρεφω ("to overthrow"), it is quite likely that the translator did not know the meaning of this unusual Hebrew root and filled the void with a word which makes sense in the context. He probably assumed the essential synonymy of רָשָׁה and הָרַם and for that reason used καταστρεφω to render both Hebrew verbs. Although this is the only time that particular Greek word renders הָרַם in the OG, you do find the same rendering in Alexandrinus (Job 12: 14; Prov. 14:1). The only other occurrence of the Hebrew רָשָׁה is in Jer. 5: 17 [( BHS prefers יָרִישׁ) יִרְשָׁה עָרֵי מִבְצָרֵיךָ = και αλοησουσιν τας πολεις τας οχυρας υμων.] It looks suspiciously as though the translator of Jeremiah did not know the Hebrew word and borrowed meanings suitable to a hypothetical

orthographically-similar  $\text{פול}$  (Pol). Although there has been a long-lived doubt about the existence of the root  $\text{פול}$ , we can with KB take the existence of the Syriac word  $\text{ܦܠ}$ , the existence of the Akkadian root *rasasu*, and the likely derivation of the place name  $\text{תַּרְשִׁישׁ}$  (which KB suggests means "foundry, refinery"), as a sound basis from which to derive the fundamental meaning of "to beat down, shatter."<sup>13</sup>

LXX renders  $\text{בנה}$  both by *οικοδομew* and *ανοικοδομew*.

και επικληθησεται αυτοις ορια ανομιας και λαος εφ ον παρατετακται κυριος  
 εως αιωνος. וקראו להם גבול רשעה והעם אשר-זעם יהוה עד-עולם:

The Future Passive of the Greek is a good rendering of the Hebrew. The 3rd plural is oftentimes used to express an indefinite subject, which can be rendered by a passive (GKC §144 f,g).

$\text{זרנ}$  is not elsewhere rendered by *πατασσω*. Rudolph translates the final Hebrew verb with *zürnt* ("and the people with whom Yahweh is forever angry [annoyed]"). He also suggests that the LXX might have confused  $\text{זרנ}$  and  $\text{זמנ}$ . He notes Zech. 1.6 where *πατασεται* renders  $\text{זמנ}$ . It is more likely that the LXX translator was using battle language to accentuate Yahweh's perpetual wrath against Edom. Other occurrences of the verb followed by the preposition *επι* include: Num 31.7; 1 Chron 19.17; Jer 6.23; 27.14 (this final passage with the meaning of to take one's stand against militarily--probably resembles the intended meaning in our passage). The heightened force of the Greek-- compared to the Hebrew might reflect the advantage of historical perspective on the downfall of Edom.<sup>14</sup>

5 και οι οφθαλμοι υμων οφονται, και υμεις ερειτε Εμεγαλυνθη κυριος

υπερανω των οριων του Ισραηλ.

:ועיניכם תראינה ואתם תאמרו יגדל יהוה מעל לגבול ישראל:

It is possible (with BHS) to imagine that the ל prefixed to גבול is the

result of dittography. However, Verhoef's comments are pertinent:

We deliberately prefer the translation of me'al (1<sup>st</sup>) as *above*, because this is how it is rendered in all the passages where it is used, with the possible exception of 2 Chro. 24:20 and 26:19 (cf. Gen. 1:7; 1 Sam. 17:39; Ezek. 1:25; Jon. 4:6; Neh. 12:31, 37; 2 Chron. 13:4). The main reason for our preference is to be found in the analysis of the discourse: the pervading theme is God's love for his people. This theme is worked out negatively by demonstrating God's love in what happened and is going to happen to Edom, and is then emphasized by Israel's acknowledgment of the greatness of God's love for his covenant people and country. The greatness of the Lord is not so much seen in his judgment upon Edom, but rather in the manifestation of his love for Israel. Our rendering of me'al (1<sup>st</sup>) is supported by the LXX *hyperano* and the Vulgate *super*. The alternative translation, 'beyond,' is supported by the Peshitta and Targum. The *territory of Israel* is preeminently contrasted with the *wicked country* of Edom: in one God's glory and love is manifested and acknowledged, in the other his anger is felt for ever.<sup>15</sup>

This assessment is probably correct, yet it must be remembered that the

Gk. υπερανω does not always in the LXX mean "above." Note esp. the clear

temporal reference in Hag. 2.16 απο της ημερας ταυτης και υπερανω.

The rest of the verse is quite straightforward. The Greek is a good

rendering of the Hebrew.

6 Υιος δοξαζει πατερα και δουλός τον κυριον αυτου. και ει πατηρ ειμι εγω, που εστιν η δοξα μου; και ει κυριος ειμι εγω, που εστιν ο φοβος μου; λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ υμιν [υμεις ?], οι ιερεις οι φαυλιζοντες το ονομα μου και ειπατε Εν τινι εφαυλισαμεν το ονομα σου; 7 προσαγοντες προς το θυσιαστηριον μου αρτους ηλισγημενους. και ειπατε Εν τινι ηλισγησαμεν αυτους; εν τω λεγειν υμας Τραπεζα κυριου εξουδενωμενη εστι και τα επιτιθεμενα βρωματα εξουδενωμενα. 8 διоти εαν προσαγαγητε τυφλον εις θυσιαν, ου κακον; και εαν προσαγαγητε χωλον η αρρωστον, ου κακον; προσαγαγε δη αυτο τω ηγουμενω σου, ει προσδεξεται σε, η ει λημψεται

προσωπον σου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

Translation: 6 A son glorifies a father and a servant his lord. And if I am a father, where is My glory? And if I am a lord, where is My fear? says the Lord Almighty, Oh you priests who defile My name. And you say, In what way have we defiled Your name? 7 *In your* bringing to My altar polluted bread. And you say, In what way have we polluted them? In that you say, The table of the Lord is despised and the foods set upon *it* are despised. 8 Because if you bring a blind one for sacrifice, is it not evil? And if you bring a lame or sick one, is it not evil? Take it to your governor. Will he receive you or will he show favor to you, says the Lord Almighty?

6

בן יכבד אב ועבד אדניו ואם־אב אני איה כבודי ואם־אדונים אני איה מוראי

Budde states, "Richtig schiebt man seit Smend (bei Wellhausen) nach dem

Zeugnis der LXX ein ירא zwischen ועבד und אדניו ein; ein hübsches

Beispiel für den Ausfall durch Ähnlichkeit der Buchstaben."<sup>16</sup> Although

the manuscript evidence for the added φοβηθησεται is far from

insubstantial, it must be noted that the addition(?) certainly smooths the

passage a bit inasmuch as it clarifies that the relationships between a father and son and a master and slave are quite different. This might be

the mark of lateness. The later scribes certainly might have been

influenced by the מוראי of the second clause.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, verse 3

showed that the author is not averse to shifting nuances rather abruptly

(ואשים את־הריו שממה + לתנות). This might be another instance of the same.

Ziegler follows the suggestion of Vollers that υμεις is merely a scribal error from υμιν. Vollers confidently asserted, "Ohne Zweifel ist jenes aus υμιν verderbt."<sup>18</sup> But, in view of the lack of attestation for

υμιν, the obvious difficulty of the attested υμεις, and the probability that the translator is merely judging the Hebrew לכם to be emphatic, it is

preferable to read with the manuscripts.

7 προσαγοντες προς το θυσιαστηριον μου αρτους ηλισγημενους. και ειπατε Εν τινι ηλισγησαμεν αυτους;

מגִּישִׁים עַל־מִזְבְּחִי לַחֵם מְגֹאֵל וְאָמַרְתֶּם בַּמָּה גִּאֲלִנֹהְךָ

Although one usually finds על being rendered by επι when in connection with θυσιαστηριον, in this instance the Greek προς probably reflects the Greek tendency to repeat the preposition attached to the verb. However, one cannot be sure for there is no other instance of προσαγω προς το θυσιαστηριον in the LXX.<sup>19</sup>

לַחֵם / αρτους The Hebrew collective singular is often rendered by the Greek plural (in MP cf. Ho. 2.5; 9.4; Am. 4.6; 8.11).

מְגֹאֵל is the Pual participle meaning "made cultically impure" The Greek which means "to be polluted" does the job nicely.

A substantial difference is found in the LXX's Εν τινι ηλισγησαμεν αυτους; The Hebrew has the 2nd masc. pronominal suffix גִּאֲלִנֹהְךָ. The Hebrew is supported by the Targums, Peshitta, Vulgate and the Ethiopic (which has "your name"). BHS suggests reading with the LXX as גִּאֲלִנֹהְךָ. However, with Verhoef and Rudolph we agree that the more difficult reading of the Hebrew should be retained. As Verhoef states:

We agree with Lattey that 'such vigorous phrasing would far more easily be changed than invented.' The idea behind this 'vigorous phrasing' is that the defiling of the sacrifices of God's altar is in itself a defiling of the Lord.<sup>20</sup>

This opinion was expressed long ago by Jerome, "For when the Sacraments are violated, Himself, whose sacraments they are, is violated."<sup>21</sup> The LXX

reading likely reflects an attempt to gloss over the idea that Yahweh could be defiled by human activity and an attempt to tighten up the logic of the passage. For the question sounds a bit superfluous. And for this reason Wellhausen and Nowack completely delete the clause. In response to this supposed breakdown in the logic of the MT, G. A. Smith suggests reading the Hebrew text differently:

Or used polluted things with respect to Thee. For a similar construction see Zech. vii. 5: צִמְתֹּנִי This in answer to Wellhausen, who, on the ground that the phrase gives לֹא־ל a wrong object and destroys the connection, deletes it.<sup>22</sup>

However, it must be questioned whether the Piel of לֹא־ל would best be translated as "to use polluted things." It is much more likely that the Piel would have a causative sense--"to defile" (Cf. BDB p. 146 and KB p. 163). And in the case of the causative Piel, the suffix would likely represent the direct object. The correspondence to Zech. 7. 5 is not very great for the verb "to fast" takes no object but an occasional cognate accusative "to fast a fast." It is most likely that you have extremely bold language in the MT which was toned down in the LXX. In like manner the LXX reads with the MT against a supposed blasphemous original in the case of the altered text of verse 13 (Cf. the discussion of the *Tiqqune Sopherim* in Chapter 2).

εν τω λεγειν υμας Τραπεζα κυριου εξουθενωμενη εστι και τα επιτιθεμενα  
βρωματα εξουθενωμενα. פֹּאמְרֵכֶם שְׁלַחַן יְהוָה נִבְזָה הוּא:

The prep. כִּי (when prefixed to an infinitive) need not be translated temporally. KB (p. 104) says, "In the literal sense כִּי in all this cases means: in that, that, the specific meaning being to be gained out of the context; the temporal determination is less strong than in sentences formed with כִּי c. inf." (*sic*.) The Greek addition και τα επιτιθεμενα



βρωματα εξουθενωμενα is variously represented in the manuscripts.

βρωματα which is found in A Q W S<sup>c</sup> is lacking in B S\* L' C.

εξουδεμωμενα is found in A Q W but -νωται in V C<sup>+</sup>, -νωσατε in B S L'

This entire little gloss is no doubt derived from v. 12.<sup>23</sup>

Θ διοτι εαν προσαγαγητε τυφλον εις θυσιαν, ου κακον; και εαν προσαγαγητε χωλον η αρρωστον, ου κακον; προσαγαγε δη αυτο τω ηγουμενω σου, ει προσδεξεται σε, η ει λημψεται προσωπον σου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

וכי־תגשון עור לזבח אין רע וכי תגישו פסח וחלה אין רע  
הקריבהו נא לפחתך הירצך או הישא פניך אמר יהוה צבאות :

See GKC §159 aa-bb for כִּי introducing a conditional clause. The LXX's εαν + Aorist subjunctive is a very common protasis in a conditional clause.<sup>24</sup> In rendering the Hiph. הקריבהו with the same Greek verb (προσαγω), the translator shows a disregard for distinguishing varying roots (at this point). However, the rendering is very common.

προσδεχομαι in the sense of "to receive favorably" is not too distant in meaning from the Hebrew רָצָה "to be pleased with." One finds the same rendering in 1.10 and 13.

Ziegler and Swete read with σε while Rahlfs has αυτο (also supported by the Vulgate). The evidence for Rahlfs' reading is very strong indeed (A Q W S<sup>c</sup>) vs. (B S\* V). The uncertainty within the Greek tradition and the likeliness that αυτο represents a harmonizing alteration makes it unwise to follow BHS and read against the MT הירצך.

η ει λημψεται προσωπον σου

או הישא פניך



The Hebrew expression to "lift up the face" can mean to receive favorably or to show partiality (KB p. 635). In Malachi, both meanings are found --the first here and the second in 2.9. This Greek expression and its related forms προσωπολη(μ)ψια, προσωπολημπτης, προσωπολημπτεω and απροσωπολημπτως are either septuagintalisms or earlier products of Hellenistic Jews. As concludes Eduard Lohse:

The translation of נָשָׂא פָנָי by λαμβανειν προσωπον is modelled closely on the Hebrew expression. In secular Greek, of course, λαμβανειν means only "to take," "to accept," never "to raise up." But since נָשָׂא can mean "to take" as well as "to lift," λαμβανειν was used for it in Greek. This rendering must have been virtually unintelligible to the Greek.<sup>25</sup>

It is a curious fact that the two ει's of verse 8 are typically read as conditional particles. (So Ziegler, Rahlfs, Swete, Hatch and Redpath and Brenton.) This would suggest that the verse should either read "Present it to your governor if he will receive you or if he will receive your face" or if there be an assumed ellipsis "Present it to your governor *and see* if he will receive you or if he will receive your face." This reading of ει is surely wrong and puts a distance between the structure of the Hebrew and the structure of the Greek which is simply not there. It is absolutely common for ει to introduce a direct question in the LXX. As Blass/Debrunner (p. 226 § 440 #3) note:

This usage is unclass., but it is found in the LXX also (Gen. 17: 17 etc., Winer 474 [Winer-M.<sup>3</sup> 638ff.]), and is therefore probably a Hebraism (Viteau 22) as a translation (along with μη) of Hebr. הֲ and הִנֵּה, which in an indirect question correspond to Greek ει, but which also introduce direct questions.

The interrogative nature of the two ει's in verse 8 is clearly proved by the

identical Hebrew structure and Greek rendering of verse 9-- **הִישָׂא מִנֶּפֶס**  
**פָּנֶי** = *ει λημφομαι εξ υμων προσωπα υμων*; and verse 13-- **הֲאֵרָצָה אֹתָהּ**  
**מִיָּדְכֶם** = *ει προσδεξομαι αυτα εκ των χειρων υμων*;

9 και νυν ἐξίλασκεσθε το προσωπον του θεου υμων και δεηθητε αυτου· εν  
 χερσιν υμων γεγονε ταυτα· *ει λημφομαι εξ υμων προσωπα υμων*; λεγει  
 κυριος παντοκρατωρ. 10 διοτι και εν υμιν συγκλεισθησονται θυραι, και ουκ  
 αναψετε το θυσιαστηριον μου δωρεαν· ουκ εστι μοι θελημα εν υμιν, λεγει  
 κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και θυσιαν ου προσδεξομαι εκ των χειρων υμων.

Translation: 9 And now propitiate the face of your God and entreat Him. These things have happened by your hands. Will I receive your faces favorably, says the Lord Almighty? 10 Because the doors will be closed among you and you shall not kindle My altar in vain. I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord Almighty, and I will not receive a sacrifice from your hands.

9. ועתה חל־נָא פני־אל ויחננו

מידכם היתה לָאֵת הִישָׂא מִנֶּפֶס פָּנֶי אֵמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת :

The Piel of חלה means "to appease," or "to put someone in a gentle mood." The Greek ἐξίλασκομαι means "to propitiate."<sup>26</sup> The Greek word almost always is a rendering of כָּפַר (Piel) which means "to atone." Interestingly, it is in the MP that one observes a greater variety of correlations: Hb. 1.11 (אָשָׁם); Zech. 7.2; 8.22 and Mal. 1.9 (חלה). It is normal for the Hebrew חלה פָּנֶי (with God as object) to be rendered by the Greek verb δεομαι (Ex. 32.11; 1 Ki. 13.12; 3 Ki. 13.6; 4 Ki. 13.4; Ps. 118.(119)58; Zech. 8.21; Jer. 33(26).19; Da. Th 9.13). The three other occurrences of this Hebrew expression in the MP are: Zech. 7.2 του ἐξίλασασθαι τον κυριον; Zech. 8.21 δεηθηναι του προσωπου κυριου and 22 του ἐξίλασκεσθαι το

προσωπον κυριου. There is no instance of ἐξίλασकोμαι rendering the Hebrew הָלַח (Pi.) outside the MP.

του θεου υμων The extra Greek pronoun is surely just an instance of smoothing as later in the verse with ἐξ υμων προσωπα υμων. Both are rather natural assimilations toward εν χειρσιν υμων (מִידֶכֶם).

και δεηθητε αυτου

MT has יִחַנְנֶנִי

The LXX has read the verb in a way appropriate for the Hithpael stem, but not for the Qal. The ambiguity of the pronominal suffix contributed to the problem. It is possible that as Verhoef suggests the translators were perhaps interested "to exempt the prophet (*us*) from having part in the guilt of the priests and people." This suggestion would gain force if the additional clause ινα ελεηση υμας be accepted as genuine (S<sup>ca</sup> L' 407, 576, 613, 770, 233', Bo, Th., Tht.) The υμας rather than the expected ημας is indeed suggestive. However, the clause is surely a rough doublet.

εν χειρσιν υμων γεγονε ταυτα

מִידֶכֶם הִיתָה זֶה

The Greek dative of instrumentality (+ εν) is so like the מֵן of source that it is not surprising that one renders the other. The meaning of this clause is very uncertain. Gelston notes that the Syriac does not represent the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew or Greek. As he states:

The modification of anthropomorphic and anthropopathic language in relation to God has often been detected in the versions, particularly in the Targums. It is however never consistently carried out in a version, and it is now widely questioned whether this is always the most natural explanation of linguistic phenomena of this kind. The avoidance of terms denoting the parts of the body in relation to God

may seem a natural instance of this kind of reverential modification, yet the rendering of מִיֶּדְכֶם by a simple *لحمه* in Ml 1 10, when the hands are human and there can be no question of avoidance of anthropomorphic language being the reason for the modification, indicates that caution is appropriate in detecting the presence of this particular motive.<sup>27</sup>

ει λημψομαι εξ υμων προσωπα υμων; λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

הִשָּׂא מִכֶּם פָּנִים אִמַּר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת :

This is the same expression with the same rendering as that in v. 8 except for the partitive *min* + suffix מִכֶּם and the second *υμων* which would represent the Hebrew פָּנֵיכֶם. The LXX has the statement in the first person. This reads better than the Hebrew because of the closing formula ("thus says the Lord of Hosts") and is thus likely a later smoothing out by the LXX translator. BHS suggests that the closing formula should be deleted on metrical grounds. This is surely a reckless suggestion.<sup>28</sup>

10 διοτι και εν υμιν συγκλεισθησονται θυραι, και ουκ αναψετε το θυσιαστηριον μου δωρεαν· ουκ εστι μοι θελημα εν υμιν, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και θυσιαν ου προσδεξομαι εκ των χειρων υμων. 11 διοτι απο ανατολων ηλιου εως δυσμων το ονομα μου δεδοξασται εν τοις εθνεσι, και εν παντι τοπω θυμιαμα προσαγεται τω ονοματι μου και θυσια καθαρη, διοτι μεγα το ονομα μου εν τοις εθνεσι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

Translation: 10 For *the* doors will be closed among you, and you will not kindle My altar in vain. There is no pleasure for Me in you, says the Lord Almighty, and I will not receive sacrifice from your hands. 11 Because from the rising of the sun till *its* setting My name is glorified among the nations. And in every place incense is offered to My name, even a pure offering. For great is My name among the Gentiles, says the Lord Almighty.

מִי גַם-כֶּכֶם וַיִּסְגֹּר דְּלֹתֵיכֶם וְלֹא-תֹאדִירוּ מִזְבְּחִי חֲנָם 10  
אֵין-לִי חֶפֶץ בָּכֶם אִמַּר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וּמִנְחָה לֹא-אֶרְצֶה מִיֶּדְכֶם :

The LXX and other early versions are very different from the Hebrew here.

Verhoef states:

The LXX *diati* reflects *ki gam* instead of *mi gam*; the LXX also reads the Hebrew verb as a Niphal, 'shall be shut,' and *ta'iru* as a singular: 'because even among you the doors shall be shut, and (one) will not kindle (the fire of) my altar for nothing.' The Vulg. deletes *gam* and the negative *la'* in the second clause: *Quis est in vobis, qui claudat ostia et incendat [sing.] altare meum*. The Targ. paraphrases 'the doors' by explaining: 'of the house of my sanctuary,' and adds: 'that you might not bring detestable sacrifices upon my altar.' The Pesh. replaces the uncommon Hebrew word *ta'iru* with a verb meaning 'to bring.'<sup>29</sup>

There can be little doubt that the Hebrew *מִי גַם־בְּכֶם וַיִּסְגֹּר דְּלֹתַיִם* means "O that someone among you would close the doors." [Cf. GKC §151a. Other occurrences of the idiom include: 1 Sam 20:10, 2 Sam. 15:4 and 2 Sam 23:15. In these three instances which include the imperfect--the LXX renders with an interrogative *τις*]. The general force of this clause in the LXX is that of a prediction of a future judgment in which God forcibly closes the doors to the temple. What is clearly a hyperbolic statement of wish in the MT is translated into sober prediction in the Greek. In this way the statement has been intensified.

οὐκ ἐστὶ μοι θελημα ἐν ὑμῖν, λέγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ

אֵין־לִי חֶפֶץ בְּכֶם אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

The remarkable literalness of the Greek rendering is noteworthy. The *אֵין חֶפֶץ* expression occurs elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 18.25 (οὐ βουλεται . . . ἐν δοματι); Jer 22.28 (οὐκ ἐστὶ χρεαι αὐτου); 48.38 (οὐκ ἐστὶ χρεαι αὐτου); Hos 8.8 (ὡς σκευος ἀχρηστον); Koh 5.3 (οὐκ ἐστὶ θελημα ἐν ἀφροσι); 12.1 (οὐκ ἐστὶ μοι ἐν αὐτοῖς θελημα). It can be seen that the only other renderings which are like the one here are the Aquila-like renderings in the LXX of Ecclesiastes.

12 υμεις δε βεβηλουτε αυτο εν τω λεγειν υμας Τραπεζα κυριου ηλισγημενη εστι, και τα επιτιθεμενα εξουδενωνται βρωματα αυτου. 13 και ειπατε Ταυτα εκ κακοπαθειας εστι, και εξεφυσησατε αυτα, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ: και εισεφερετε αρπαγματα και τα χωλα και τα ενοχλουμενα: και εαν φερητε την θυσιαν, ει προσδεξομαι αυτα εκ των χειρων υμων; λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. 14 και επικαταρατος ος ην δυνατος και υπηρχεν εν τω ποιμνιω αυτου αρσεν και ευχη αυτου επ αυτω και θυει διεφθαρμενον τω κυριω: διоти βασιλευς μεγας εγω ειμι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και το ονομα μου επιφανες εν τοις εθνεσιν.

Translation: 11 For from the rising of the sun until its setting, glorious is My name among the nations. And in every place incense is offered to My name and a pure sacrifice, for great is My name among the nations says the Lord Almighty. 12 But you have profaned it in that you say, The table of the Lord is polluted and the foods placed upon it are despised. 13 And you say, These things are of suffering, and you puff them away, says the Lord Almighty. And you bring in those things which are torn and the lame and the afflicted. And if you should bring the sacrifice, will I receive it from your hands, says the Lord Almighty? 14 Indeed cursed is whoever is able and should have in his flock a male and his vow should be upon him and should sacrifice something corrupted to the Lord. Because I am a great king, says the Lord Almighty, and My name is glorious among the nations.

כי ממזרח-שמש ועד-מבוא גדול שמי בגוים 11  
 ובכל-מקום מקטר מגש לשמי ומנחה טהורה כי-גדול שמי  
 בגוים אמר יהוה צבאות :

מבוא Dingermann rightly comments that, "Das Suffix wurde wie so oft, wenn die Beziehung klar ist, nicht übersetzt."<sup>30</sup>

גדולשמי το ονομα μου δεδοξασται δεξαζω renders the adjective

גדול elsewhere only in Esther 10:3 (וגדול ליהודים = και δεδοξασμενος υπο των Ιουδαιων). Although Vollers speculates that the translator read the form as the Pual גדל, inasmuch as there is only one instance of the

Pual in the Hebrew Bible (of plants in Ps. 144.12 "grown up"), we must regard such a suggestion as very unlikely. The time frame of the LXX of the verse is clearly present. Although the Perfect might have a past meaning, it is more often used to refer to a presently existing state. And the next verb προσαγεται makes it very clear that the action is present. This Greek verse soon began to be regarded by the Christian Church as predictive of the world-wide worship to be offered God through the new spiritual worship of the Christian dispensation.<sup>31</sup>

*See facing page.*

*Compare*

12 אֱתֹו ^ the discussion in Chapter 2 concerning the Tiqqune  
 Sophirim. The original reading ^ אֱתֹו <sup>might have been</sup> [God is the object of the verb in  
 Ezek. 13.19 (ותחללנה אֱתֹו = και εβεβηλουν με). A similar passage  
 (although the verb is in the Niphal and thus is passive) is Ezek.22.26 "Her  
 priests have violated My law and profaned My holy things; they have not  
 distinguished between the holy and unholy, nor have they made known the  
 difference between the unclean and the clean; and they have hidden their

however be included here. This was the simple expedient of omission in



eyes from My Sabbaths, so that I am profaned among them" (וַאֲחַל בְּתוֹכָם = και εβεβηλουμην εν μεσω αυτων).] The MT pointing relates the suffix to שָׁמַיָּא mentioned in the previous verse. The Greek αυτο similarly relates to the Neut. ονομα.

τα επιτιθεμενα εξουθενωνται βρωματα αυτου It is quite unclear whether τα επιτιθεμενα βρωματα is the noun clause with the participle qualifying the noun, or if the participle is functioning as the independent subject with the following noun being in apposition. The translation of Sir Lancelot Brenton is probably right--"and His meats set thereon are despised."

וְנִיבֹ ("and its fruit") It would be most natural to associate the pronominal suffix יָ with the masculine noun שִׁלְחָן. However, the Greek word for table Τραπεζα is feminine and for that reason the αυτου of βρωματα αυτου must relate to the earlier κυριου.

BHS suggests that we should delete וְנִיבֹ on the grounds that it is the result of dittography נִבְיָה and is not represented by the <sup>Targums</sup> א or Peshitta. KB (p. 614) suggest that the word might be a gloss. Dingermann (p. 229) suggests that the LXX translator read the Hebrew of the MT wrongly as וְנִבְיָ as a Niphal of בִּינָא. However, when one considers that the word only occurs two times in the MT and that in the other occurrence in Isa. 57.19 the clause בִּינָא נִיבֹ שְׁפָתַי is simply omitted, then the solution becomes rather simple. The word was not known, and it was omitted. As Gelston states concerning the omission in the Peshitta: "One further method of dealing with unintelligible words and phrases in the *Vorlage* may however be included here. This was the simple expedient of omission. In

contrast with the minuses considered in the previous section the following, most of which are peculiar to the Peshitta, are probably to be accounted for in this way.<sup>32</sup> He includes among the list Mal. 1 12 **נִיבּוֹ**.

13

**הִנֵּה / הִנֵּה** The LXX and Peshitta have read with a different vocalisation.

**מִתְּלָאָה** The LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate read with different

vocalisation--**מִן** thus **מִן**.<sup>33</sup> **תְּלָאָה** is apparently derived from **לָאָה**

(to be or become weary) and thus means "weariness" or "hardship." The assimilation of **מִן** in **מִתְּלָאָה** is discussed in GKC §37c.

**ἐκ κακοπαθείας** **ἐστί** The noun only occurs in 2 Mac. 2.26,27; 4 Mac. 9.8. The verb occurs only in Jon. 4.10.

**ἐξεφυσήσατε / ἐξεφυσήσα αὐτὰ** **והפחיתם אותו/אותי**

Ziegler has judged **ἐξεφυσήσατε** to be the original reading. This reading is supported only by Sinaiticus, 130 (XII-XIII), 239 (1046) and Jerome.

Ziegler's note suggests that he thinks the vast majority of the

manuscripts have assimilated toward Haggai 1.9 (**וּנְפַחְתִּי בּוֹ** = **καὶ**

**ἐξεφυσήσα αὐτὰ**). It is certainly much more likely that the 4 manuscripts supporting **ἐξεφυσήσατε** have assimilated toward the Hebrew. For the

**אֹתוֹ** has traditionally been regarded as one of the Tiquenne

Sopherim--original **אֹתִי**. Surely the switch in the person of the verb would represent a similarly motivated reverential alteration of the text.<sup>34</sup>

τα ενοχλούμενα

החולה The Hebrew participle

meaning "the weak" or "the sick" was nicely rendered in v. 8 by αρρωστον. Here one finds the present pass. part. from a verb meaning "to trouble, disquiet, annoy." (Cf. Gen 48.1; I Ki 19.14; 30.13 for a similar rendering). It is possible that the rendering reflects the view that sickness suggests affliction by the spirit world. (Cf. Luke 6.18 οἱ ἦλθον ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νοσῶν αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο.) It is quite noteworthy that this view of the spiritual causes of sickness might be applied even to animals.<sup>35</sup>

καὶ εἰς φέρητε τὴν θυσίαν, εἰ προσδεξομαι αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;  
 וְהִבֵּאתֶם אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה הָאֵרֶצָה אוֹתָהּ מִיֶּדְכֶם אָמַר יְהוָה׃  
 The syntactical function of the first clause is very uncertain. The verbs of the verse which would be most suggestive in establishing the force are:

וְאָמַרְתֶּם הִנֵּה מִתְּלָאָה וְהִפַּחְתֶּם אוֹתָהּ אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת  
 וְהִבֵּאתֶם גִּזְוִיל וְאֶת־הַפֶּסֶח וְאֶת־הַחֹלֶה וְהִבֵּאתֶם אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה  
 הָאֵרֶצָה אוֹתָהּ מִיֶּדְכֶם אָמַר יְהוָה׃

In view of the clearly established verbal sequence, it would be a bit surprising to have the clause in question suddenly pick up an interrogative or conditional force. The continuity of verbal force would be nicely established if one could justifiably translate the clause "and you offer them as sacrifice." However, the reading is not justifiable. The suffix just is not there and an imagined ellipsis is just too incomprehensible. [Although Rudolph (p. 260) suggests emending to מִנְחָה אֵתָהּ "and you bring her as an offering." This is conceivable, but one wonders why there would be a feminine rather than masculine pronoun. Furthermore, it

is not so easy to understand how that easy reading would have been absolutely supplanted in the textual tradition by the much more difficult reading. Furthermore, a reading such as he suggests would not explain what we find in the LXX.]

It is, however, possible for a summation clause to be introduced by nothing but the  $\text{ל}$ . Thus Gen 2.1 'thus the heavens and the earth were completed'. This is perhaps the best way to read this clause--"thus you bring the offering." Surely, the LXX translator was simply trying to make sense of the ambiguous Hebrew syntax. It would be misguided to emend the MT on the basis of it at this point.

λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. The LXX has added παντοκρατωρ in assimilation to the earlier part of the verse.

וַאֲרוּר נוֹכַל וַיֵּשׁ בַּעֲדָרָו זָכָר וְנָדָר וְזִבְחַת מִשְׁחַת לְאֲדָנִי 14  
 כִּי מֶלֶךְ גָּדוֹל אֲנִי אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְשָׁמִי נוֹרָא בְּגוֹיִם :

ος ην δυνατος נוֹכַל is the Qal Act. Part. from a root meaning "to act

cunningly or deceitfully." This is the only occurrence of the verb in the Qal stem. The LXX is derived from יוֹכַל. The ancient נ and כ could easily have been confused. The Peshitta does not represent the word in question. Gelston states, "In MI i 14 the omission of נוֹכַל in the Peshitta, already noted at p. 133 *supra*, may have been due to the influence of its rendering in LXX by δυνατος, a concept which the Peshitta translators may have felt was already adequately represented in the rest of the clause."<sup>36</sup>

αρευν זָכָר There is no doubt that the LXX is translating the same word as that in the MT. However, it is not clear how the word is particularly

sensible. Why would a male be regarded as the opposite of a blemished animal? It is in view of this uncertain parallelism that BHS and Rudolph (following Horst) suggest that there was originally an unknown adjective זָכָה from the verbal stem meaning to be impure. However, Baldwin notes: "The particular example given in this verse is the voluntary offering, vowed under stress as a thanksgiving if God will grant deliverance (Gn. 28:20-22; Nu. 30:2; Jon. 2:9). A *male* animal is specified for such a sacrifice in Leviticus 22:19."<sup>37</sup>

και ευχη αυτου επ αυτω וְנִדְרָו (ו) Perhaps the ו dropped out by haplography.

δικοφθαρμενον מושחת The masc. sing. Hoph. part. means "ruined or  
 ט : ט

spoiled." KB (p. 963) suggest "castrated?" If that in fact be the intended meaning, then perhaps some light is shed on the previously-mentioned contrast. Surely a common way that an animal would be ruined would be for its breeding capabilities to be impaired. Thus in the context "male" might mean an animal with its virility unimpaired.

και το ονομα μου επιφανες εν τοις εθνεσιν. וְשִׁמִּי נִרְאָה בְּגוֹיִם :

The rendering of the LXX is typical. In fact the regularity with which the Niphal of נִרְאָה is rendered by this adjective makes it very unlikely that you have a simple misreading of נִרְאָה. It is more likely that the LXX translators had a preference for the idea of "glorious" over against "fearful."

reflect the plural of the Hebrew נִרְאָה. This supports the regularity of a supposed correspondence to the singular form of נִרְאָה. This is possible, yet the difficulty of the plural might suggest its

## Chapter 2

1 Και νυν η εντολη αυτη προς υμας, οι ιερεις· 2 εαν μη ακουσητε, και εαν μη θησθε εις την καρδιαν υμων του δουναι δοξαν τω ονοματι μου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και εξαποστελω εφ υμας την καταραν και επικαταρασσομαι την ευλογιαν υμων και καταρασσομαι αυτην· [και διασκεδασω την ευλογιαν υμων, και ουκ εσται εν υμιν], οτι υμεις ου τιθεσθε εις την καρδιαν υμων. 3 ιδου εγω αφοριζω υμιν τον ωμον και σκορπιω ενυστρον επι τα προσωπα υμων, ενυστρον εορτων υμων, και λημψομαι υμας εις το αυτο·

Translation: 1 And now, this commandment is to you, O Priests. 2 If you do not heed or if you do not put it in your heart to give glory to my name, says the Lord Almighty, indeed I will send forth upon you the curse and I will curse your blessing, indeed I will curse it. [*And I will render ineffectual your blessing, and it will not be among you*], because you did not put it in your heart. 3 Behold I am setting aside for you the shoulder and I will scatter stomach upon your faces--stomach of your feasts, and I shall take you into it.

1-3 There are numerous differences between the Hebrew and Greek of these three verses. The first to be observed is that the Greek includes an expected pronoun **לְלֵב** = **θησθε εις την καρδιαν υμων** (cf. vs. 2 **לְלֵב** = **τιθεσθε εις την καρδιαν υμων**). But we are surely right to follow Dingermann in viewing this to be an addition of the translator: "Das Pronomen ist vom Übersetzer hinzugefügt. Er dachte dabei vielleicht an Agg. 1,5,7; 2,18 (vgl. auch den LXX-Zusatz Mal. 1,1)." (p. 230) There really is no good reason to imagine a different *Vorlage* here. Secondly, one notes that the Greek **επικαταρασσομαι την ευλογιαν υμων** does not reflect the plural of the Hebrew **בְּרִכּוֹתֵיכֶם**. BHS suspects the superiority of a supposed **בְּרִכַּתְּכֶם** corresponding to the singular suffix of **אֲרוֹתֶיךָ**.<sup>7</sup> This is possible, yet the difficulty of the plural might suggest its

originality.

και διασκεδασω την ευλογιαν υμων, και ουκ εσται εν υμιν, These two clauses have been regarded as "a clear case of verbose expansion."<sup>38</sup> However, it is much more correct to judge them to be two separate doublets of the Hebrew text: **וְאֵרוּתִי אֶת־בְּרִכּוֹתֵיכֶם** = επικαταρασσομαι την ευλογιαν υμων and διασκεδασω την ευλογιαν υμων; **אִינְכֶם שְׁמִים עַל־לֵב** = υμεις ου τιθεσθε εις την καρδιαν υμων and και ουκ εσται εν υμιν. Although Dingermann's view that it is "ausgenommen" that the two doublets could derive from the translator himself is perhaps a bit overstated, it is quite true that the second doublet implies an entirely different grammatical function of **אִינְכֶם**.<sup>39</sup> For whereas in the first rendering of the Hebrew clause **אִינְכֶם** is viewed as in a bound structure with the following infinitive, in the case of the doublet the Hebrew is read as though it were **אִין בְּכֶם**. This was likely a marginal gloss which later was incorporated into the text. Nevertheless, its incorporation into the text was evidently so early that it found its way into virtually the entire manuscript tradition. For this reason, it is perhaps correct to view it as an authentic part of the early septuagintal tradition. And as such it should probably be judged to mean that the benedictory force of the priestly blessing upon the offerer was being annulled so that the power which was to attend such priestly blessings would not in the future be found among them (Cf. Num. 6. 22-7). The verb διασκεδαζω is a stereotypical rendering of the Hebrew verb **פָּרַר** (Hi.) and often occurs in contexts which suggest the nullification or frustration of the covenant with God (Gen. 17.14, Lev. 26.15, 44; Zech. 11.10) or the counsel of men (2 Sam. 15.31, 34; Ezra 4.5). It would function very nicely in a context suggesting the nullification of



what were in the past powerful and effective priestly blessings. Although a different Greek verb is found in the passage, a very suggestive use of פָּרַר (Hi.) is found in Num. 30 where it is specified when the vows of a woman might be rendered ineffectual (vv. 9,14). It is also quite possible that the the Greek verb διασκαδίζω was used because the Hebrew typically behind it shares the double ר of the verb "to curse" (פָּרַר / אָרַר). This would then constitute an example of palaeographically tendentious translation.

הנני גער לכם את־הזרע / MT εγω σφοριζω υμιν τον ωμον

Most modern commentators have concluded that the *Variante* of the LXX was הנני ג'דע or ג'רע לכם את־הזרע. There are difficulties in the suggestion. First, it must be observed that in the LXX σφοριζω never renders ג'רע or ג'דע and ωμος never renders זרע. But it does seem quite likely that the translator is viewing the form הזרע as referring to that special priestly portion, the shoulder.<sup>40</sup> For the translator's method is surely clarified when one considers his rendering of the next clause και σκοπιω ενυστρον επι τα προσωπα υμων, ενυστρον εορτων υμων. ενυστρον, which means the fourth stomach of a ruminating animal only occurs in Deut. 18.3 and in this passage. The Deuteronomy passage is instructive, ונתת לכהן הדרע וזולת יימ וזולת יימ וזולת יימ και δωσεις τον βραχιονα τω ιερει και τα σιαγονια και το ενυστρον. The ενυστρον is listed along with the upper arm and cheeks as the special gifts to the priests. What is also quite suggestive is the fact that the Hebrew פֶּרֶשׁ simply does not mean the same as the Greek word ενυστρον. For the Hebrew word פֶּרֶשׁ, in its every occurrence means either the contents of the stomach or of the intestines,

never the stomach itself. And in every other occurrence of פֶּרֶשׁ in the Hebrew Bible, the Greek renders with the close equivalent κοπρος which means "dung" (Ex. 29.14, Lev. 4.11; 8.17; 16.27; Num. 19.5).<sup>41</sup> Thus it is very clear that in Malachi 2 we are dealing with a deliberately tendentious translation. And the nature of the tendency in the passage is to focus on the special priestly gifts. It is against this background that one can understand the translator's choice of the verb αφορίζω. For when one examines the usage of the verb αφορίζω in the LXX, one is immediately struck by its special function in Exodus 29 which describes the consecration, purification and investiture of the priests. For in verses 24, 26, and 27 those special offerings which are waved are in the Greek said to be set aside (αφορίζω) as a set apart offering (αφορισμα). Thus the meaning in Malachi 2 appears to be that Yahweh sarcastically tells the priests that He has set apart for them their special portions, but not for their usual enjoyment but rather in order that He might humiliate and befoul them with it. Whereas in verse 2 Yahweh indicated that He had taken away the priests' benedictory power, now He makes it clear that they are no longer to enjoy their sumptuous priestly feasts. What is threatened is no less than the abrogation of the entire priestly order. The translator, working from his understanding of the likely significance of הִזְרִיעַ, and then translating פֶּרֶשׁ tendentiously and finally freely importing αφορίζω from that ultimate text about the priests gifts, Ex. 29, has created a beautifully crafted and elaborate threat of disinvestiture. It is unlikely that the Hebrew should be read in the same way. The LXX translator has skillfully gone his own way.<sup>42</sup>

וְנִשְׂאֵה אֶתְכֶם אֵלָיו: καὶ ληψομαι υμας εις το αυτο:

The Hebrew verb, with its indefinite third person, should probably be viewed as an impersonal passive. And if the translator read the construction in that way, then it is likely that he was merely making the unknown subject explicit and continuing the verbal construction which preceded *εγω αφοριζω . . . και σκορπιω . . . και λημφομαι* (See Stekhoven p. 87) It would be quite natural to read *εις το αυτο* temporally ("at the same time") as does Brenton, yet it looks as though the translator is following the structure of the Hebrew quite closely. And if the translator is following the structure of the Hebrew then it is probable that he has retained the directional force of *ל* (as in the next verse *לְיָכֶם* = *προς υμας*). If that be the case, then the Greek means "and I shall take you *and place you* into *more* of the same." The translator imagines that Yahweh is not satisfied to scatter bits of stomach (or perhaps by metonymy its contents) on the priests, rather they are to be placed in a heap of it.

4 και επιγνωσεσθε διوتي εγω εξαπεσταλκα προς υμας την εντολην ταυτην του ειναι την διαθηκην μου προς τους Λευιτας, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.  
 5 η διαθηκη μου ην μετ αυτου της ζωης και της ειρηνης, και εδωκα αυτω εν φοβω φοβεισθαι με και απο προσωπου ονοματος μου στελλεσθαι αυτον.  
 6 νομος αληθειας ην εν τω στοματι αυτου, και αδικια ουχ ευρεθη εν χειλεσιν αυτου· εν ειρηνη κατευθυνων επορευθη μετ εμου και πολλους επεστρεφεν απο αδικιας. 7 οτι χειλη ιερεως φυλαξεται γνωσιν, και νομον εκζητησουσιν εκ στοματος αυτου, διوتي αγγελος κυριου παντοκρατορος εστιν.

Translation: 4 And you will know that I have sent this commandment to you, that My covenant might be with the Levites, says the Lord Almighty. 5 My covenant was with him, *a covenant* of life and of peace. And I granted to him that he might greatly fear Me and might stand aloof from before My name. 6 A true judgment was in his mouth and unrighteousness was not found in his lips. Directing *others* in peace, he proceeded with Me and turned many from unrighteousness. 7 For the lips of a priest will

guard knowledge and they will seek a judgment from his mouth, because he is the messenger of the Lord Almighty.

και επιγνωσασθε διοτι Although διοτι often has a causal force, it is certainly not particularly unusual for διοτι to introduce a noun clause.<sup>43</sup>

προς τους Λευιτας את־לוי In this verse Levi refers to the priestly family which descended from Levi. In verse 8 לוי refers to the historical person. The LXX makes this distinction explicit with its different renderings.

και εδωκα αυτω εν φοβω φοβεισθαι με ואתנם־לו מורא וייראני

The pronominal suffix of ואתנם is not represented in the Greek. But this is best explained as having been lost in the rather substantial grammatical transformation of the translation. For the translator has taken מורא וייראני as the object clause of ואתנם and has in the process lost the resultive force of the Hebrew וייראני. There was no place for an objective suffix when the following clause was read in that way. The implication of the reading of the Greek is very substantial. For whereas the Hebrew should probably be read as listing three components of the covenant with Eli in terms of two blessings (life and peace) and one obligation (reverential fear), in the Greek even the obligatory fear is a blessing of God.<sup>44</sup>

και απο προσωπου ονοματος μου στελλεσθαι αυτον ומפני שמי נחת הוא

Rengstorff argues that στελλεσθαι in this passage suggests "the idea of priestly service, namely, 'to place oneself at disposal,' to be available

(for ministry).<sup>45</sup> However, the rendering of Hesychius (στελλεται φοβεται), and the rather clear parallelism with φοβισθαι suggests the idea of "*keep away, stand aloof* απο τινος (Polyb. 8,22, 4; cf. Mal 2: 5) *from someone* 2 Th 3: 6." (BAGD p. 766).<sup>46</sup>

The renderings of ΠΠΠ (Ni.) are: Deut. 1.21 δειλιασητε 31.8 δειλια Josh 1.9 φοβηθης (transposition?) 8.1 δειλιασης 10.25 δειλιασητε 1 Sam. 2.10 ασθενη ποιησει 17.11 εξεστησαν Isa. 7.8 εκλειπει 30.31 ηττηθησονται 31.4 ηττηθησαν 51.6 εκλειπη 7 ηττασθε Jer. 1.17 πτοηθης 10.2 φοβισθε, φοβουνται 17.18 πτοηθεισαν 23.4 πτοηθησονται 30.10 δειλιασης 46.27 πτοηθης Eze. 2.6 εκστης 3.9 πτοηθης Job 21.13 εκοιμηθησαν 39.22 ? 1 Chron. 22.13 πτοηθης 28.20 πτοηθης 2 Chron. 20.15 πτοηθητε 17 πτοηθητε 32.7 πτοηθητε The only other occurrences in the MP are: in Qal Ob. 9 πτοηθησονται and in Hiphil Hab. 2.17 πτοησει (Hebrew uncertain)

It seems very unlikely that the translator did not know the meaning of the root. Nor is it likely that he was thinking of an Aramaic word (so Vollers p. 75), rather it is more probable that he was making concrete the abstract concept of the "terror" which the Levis manifested. And this "terror" was manifested in their keeping a proper distance between themselves and Yahweh. This standing aloof in reverential fear is a perfect contrast to the priests of Malachi's day who are brazenly coming before Yahweh with all sorts of defective offerings.

εν ειρηνη κατευθυνων επορευθη μετ εμου בְּשָׁלוֹם וּבְמִישׁוֹר הָלַךְ אֲתִי

The rendering κατευθυνων is surprising and has led many to suppose that the translator read the Piel Participle rather than the noun form (מִישׁוֹר)

However, the noun מִישׁוֹר was very often mistranslated throughout the

LXX. It is rendered by: Deut. 3.10 Μισωρ 4.43 πεδινη Josh. 13.9 Μισωρ 16 Μισωρ 17 Μισωρ 21 Μισωρ 20.8 πεδιω 1 Ki. 20.23 κατ ευθυ 25 κατ ευθυ Isa.

40.4 εις ευθειαν 42.16 εις ευθειαν Jer. 21.13 πεδινην 48.8 η πεδινη 21 Μεισωρ Ps. 26.12 εν ευθυτητι 27.11 ευθεια 143.10 ευθεια 2 Chron. 26.10 πεδινη Abstract sense: Isa. 11.4 not translated Ps. 45.7 ευθυτητος 67.5 εν ευθυτητι

The only other occurrence of the noun מִישׁוֹר in the MP is in Zech. 4.7

τις ει συ, το ορος το μεγα, προ προσωπου Ζοροβαβελ του κατορθωσαι;

מִישׁוֹר אֶת־הָרִים הַגְּדֹלִים לִפְנֵי זְרֻבָבֶל לְמִישׁוֹר

It is surely significant that one finds an inappropriate verbal rendering only in the MP. This was apparently his way of dealing with a form which confused many of the LXX translators.

8 υμεις δε εξεκλινατε εκ της οδου και ησθενησατε πολλους εν νομω, διεφθειρατε την διαθηκην του Λευι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. 9 και εγω δεδωκα υμας εξουδενωμενους και παρειμενους εις παντα τα εθνη, ανθ ων υμεις ουκ εφυλαξασθε τας οδους μου, αλλα ελαμβανετε προσωπα εν νομω.

Translation: 8 But you have turned aside from the way and you have made many weak in judgment: you have corrupted the covenant of Levi, says the Lord Almighty. 9 And I have made you despised and neglected unto all the nations, because you did not guard My ways, but you showed partiality in judgment.

ησθενησατε πολλους εν νομω הכשלתם רבי בתורה

It is strange to find ασθενεω with a causative sense. One would expect

the Hiphil of כָּשַׁל to be rendered by ασθενω or ασθενιζω. But those

forms never occur in the LXX. The occurrences of the Hiphil of כָּשַׁל are:

Jer. 18.15 ασθενησουσιν (both the subject and the object of the Hebrew

are uncertain ויכשילום), Ezek. 36.15 ατεκνωσεις (stereotypical rendering

of כָּשַׁל which occurs several times in the context), Ps. 64.9 ? εφοβηθη,

Prov. 4.16 not translated, Lam. 1.14 כָּחַל הַכְשִׁיל = ησθενησεν η ισχυς μου



(the grammatical object of the Hebrew causative verb becomes the grammatical subject of the Greek stative verb), 2 Chron. 25.8 (2x) τροπασεται, τροπασασθαι [This is surely borrowed from verse 22 where the same verb renders the Hebrew נִגַּל (Ni.)], 28.23 σκωλον (typically a rendering of מִשְׁוֹל "snare" but not an inappropriate rendering of מִכְשׁוֹל "stumbling block")

The great variety of renderings of the Hiphil of כָּשַׁל suggests that throughout the LXX, the translators were somewhat at a loss concerning its precise meaning, or at least how it should best be rendered. The translator of the MP demonstrated his confusion and creativity in placing a stative verb in a construction where it must have a causative nuance.

και εγω δεδωκα υμας εξουθενωμενους και παρειμενους εις παντα τα εθνη  
וּגְם־אֲנִי נֹתֵתִי אֶתְכֶם נְכֻזִּים וְשֹׁפְלִים לְכָל־הָעַם

παρειμενους is the perfect passive participle of παριημι and means "to have been neglected" or "to have been left in a weakened state." (BAGD p. 627). The Hebrew שָׁפַל means "low" or "humble." It is likely that there are two reasons why the translator used this Greek word. First, the implication of being in a weakened state provides a nice correspondence to the debilitating poor judgments of the priests (και ησθενησατε πολλους εν νομω). Second and more decisively, the choice of the word fits in nicely with the tendentious alteration of the singular לְכָל־הָעַם to the plural εις παντα τα εθνη. Whereas the Hebrew would surely mean that the priests would be held in contempt by the people of Israel, the Greek would most naturally mean that the priests are neglected by Yahweh in their being scattered throughout the various Gentile nations. This idea of diaspora would reflect the historical circumstances of the



translator and might suggest something of the experience of that period.<sup>47</sup> Whereas the reading of *παρσιμενους* focusses on the fact that the Jews are left neglected in the Diaspora, the widely-attested scribal correction to various forms of *ριπτω* (*παρα, απο*) stresses the fact that Yahweh had cast them off into the various Gentile nations.

10 Ουχι θεος εις εκτισεν ημας; ουχι πατηρ εις παντων ημων; τι οτι εγκατελιπετε εκαστος τον αδελφον αυτου του βεβηλωσαι την διαθηκην των πατερων ημων; 11 εγκατελειφθη Ιουδας, και βδελυγμα εγενετο εν τω Ισραηλ και εν Ιερουσαλημ, διοτι εβεβηλωσεν Ιουδας τα αγια κυριου, εν οις ηγαπησε, και επετηδευσεν εις θεους αλλοτριους. 12 εξολεθρευσει κυριος τον ανθρωπον τον ποιουντα ταυτα, εως και ταπεινωθη εκ σκηνωματων Ιακωβ και εκ προσαγοντων θυσιαν τω κυριω παντοκρατορι. 13 και ταυτα, α εμισουν, εποιειτε: εκαλυπτετε δακρυσι το θυσιαστηριον κυριου και κλαυθμω και στεναγμω εκ κοπων. ετι αξιον επιβλεψαι εις θυσιαν η λαβειν δεκτον εκ των χειρωνυμων;

Translation: 10 Did not one God create us? Do not we all have one father? Why has each one of you forsaken his brother to profane the covenant of our fathers? 11 Judah has been forsaken, and an abomination has occurred in Israel, even in Jerusalem. For Judah has profaned the sanctuary of the Lord, which He loves, and has gone after foreign gods. 12 The Lord will destroy the man who does these things until he be humbled from the tabernacles of Jacob and from those offering sacrifice to the Lord Almighty. 13 And these things, which I hated, you did: you covered the altar of the Lord with tears and mourning and groaning because of troubles. Yet is it right that I should look favorably upon the sacrifice or receive it as welcomed from your hands?

10 The translator betrays his view of *πατηρ εις* through the interchanging of the two clauses. Viewing (perhaps wrongly?) the "one father" to be either Abraham or Jacob, he deemed it more reverent to show preference to God the creator through the alteration of the order of the clauses. Surely the creator has preeminence even over the great

patriarch.

τι οτι εγκατελιπετε εκαστος מְדִיעַ נִבְגַּד אִישׁ בְּאָחִיו

The pointing of נִבְגַּד is rather unexpected. It is possible with four manuscripts of Kennicott to repoint with the expected *holem*. However, it is probably best to retain the pointing which for some reason in this instance alone follows the vocalisation of the stative verb (or 2nd or 3rd Gutturals). It is impossible to make any sense of the Niphal. The second person of the Greek is certainly no grounds for altering the Hebrew, for as we observed already in Mal. 1.9, the translator is at pains to exempt the prophet from the guilt of the priests. [See discussion of Mal. 1.9 (καὶ δεηθητε αὐτοῦ MT וְיִתְחַנֵּן).] It is interesting to note that only in the MP is εγκαταλειπω found as a rendering of נִבְגַּד. Elsewhere εγκαταλειπω is usually as expected a rendering of some form of עָזַב. עָזַב in the MP is rendered: Hos. 4.10 εγκατελιπον, Jon. 2.9 εγκατελιπον, Zeph. 2.4 διηρπασμενη (borrowed from v. 9 ?), Zech. 11.17 καταλελοιποτες, Mal. 3.19 υπολειφθη. However, that departure or forsaking is somehow implicit in the treachery of נִבְגַּד is clear from Jer. 3.20 מְרַעֶה אִשָּׁה בְּגֵדָה (see esp. BDB p. 93).

11 εγκατελειφθη Ιουδας בְּגֵדָה יְהוּדָה Because of the lack of an object in the Hebrew and the following verb in Niphal, the translator imagined a passive meaning for בְּגֵדָה.<sup>48</sup> All of the occurrences of נִבְגַּד in the MP are: Hos. 5.7 εγκατελιπον, 6.7 κατεφρονησε, Hab. 1.13 κατεφρονουντας, 2.5 καταφρονητης, Mal. 2.10 εγκατελιπετε, 11 εγκατελειφθη, 14 εγκατελιπες, 15 εγκαταλιπης, 16 εγκαταλιπητε. There are no parallels for the switch in voice. The Greek εγκατελειφθη Ιουδας, if it be anything other than

nonsense, would suggest that in the conditions of the Diaspora in which the Jews were dispersed throughout the Gentile nations, this separation from the holy land constituted an abandonment by the people. And as such, it becomes in the Greek part of a triad of offenses against Yahweh for which He is about (or has already begun) to judge his people.

τα αγια κυριου קִדְשׁ יְהוָה The plural is typically used in reference to the sanctuary (BAGD p. 10). The Hebrew probably refers to the same.

καὶ ἐπετηδευσεν εἰς θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους ובעל בת-אל נבר

Dingermann's view of this clause is helpful. He states:

Sehr wahrscheinlich handelt es sich hier um eine absichtliche Änderung durch den Übersetzer. Er wählt einen allgemeinen Ausdruck, da in der alexandrinischen Diaspora bezüglich der Mishehe die alte strenge Weisung nicht mehr befolgt wurde.<sup>49</sup>

Interestingly, this is not the only time that the LXX translator opts for a deliberately general or abstract rendering where the Hebrew has a very specific and concrete meaning with reference to foreign women. For as noted by Hengel:

The foreign woman who appears frequently in Prov. 1-9 (2.16ff.; ch. 5; 6.24ff; ch. 7), and probably also the foolish woman, were already interpreted metaphorically in the Septuagint of Prov. 2.16-18 (διδασκαλίαν νεότητος, v. 17) as referring to 'foreign wisdom', whereas Clement of Alexandria later interpreted Prov. 5.3 as Ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία and probably took over this conception from Alexandrian Jewish exegesis.<sup>50</sup>

Whereas in the Hebrew the danger is the אִשָּׁה זָרָה, in the Greek the enemy is explicitly stated to be κακὴ βουλή. And while Hengel might be right in thinking that an apologetic interest in preventing "the development of an alien wisdom which endangered traditional belief" lie behind the LXX of Proverbs 2, it is very likely that much as in the case of Mal. 2 the

translator is interested to make a distinction between the pagan women and the spiritual (or philosophical ?) dangers they might represent. For the Greek texts would not explicitly exclude intermarriage with Gentile women if the attendant dangers of an alien wisdom or of idolatrous worship were carefully avoided.<sup>51</sup>

The other renderings of כָּלַל in a marital sense are: Deut. 21.13 συνοικισθησθαι αυτη, 24.1 συνοικησθαι αυτη, Isa. 54.5 untranslated, 62.5 (2x) συνοικων, κατοικησουσιν. Thus, επιτηδευσεν is quite clearly a free rewriting which eliminates all marital connotations.

12 εξολεθρευσει κυριος τον ανθρωπον τον ποιουντα ταυτα, εως και ταπεινωθη εκ σκηνωματων Ιακωβ και εκ προσαγοντων θυσιαν τω κυριω παντοκρατορι.

Whereas the Hebrew כָּרַת means "to cut off" the Greek actually means "to destroy." Yet the rendering is stereotypical. The singular suffix of יַעֲשֶׂנָה only looks to the previous clause, whereas the plural ταυτα refers to all of verses 10 and 11. εως και ταπεινωθη represents the reading עַד וְעִנָּה.

In view of the clear difficulty of the Hebrew merism of the MT and in light of the plain rewriting which we observed in the previous clause, it is very unwise to alter the MT on the basis of the Greek.<sup>52</sup> The meaning of the Greek would be that Yahweh would so utterly destroy the man offending in these ways that he would be permanently removed in humiliation from among the holy nation and more particularly from among those who offer sacrifices to Yahweh. The second εκ should not suggest that an original מִמִּגִּישׁ had been corrupted by haplography, rather the force of the מ in מִמִּגִּישׁ has been judged to apply to the second clause as well.

13 και ταυτα, α εμισουν, εποιειτε' וַיֵּאָת לִשְׁנִית תַּעֲשׂוּ

Clearly the translator has misread the adjective לִשְׁנִית as the verb לִשְׁנִית. Except for the case of the gloss in Hag. 2.15, every occurrence of μισω in the MP corresponds to the Qal of וַיֵּאָת. Other occurrences of לִשְׁנִית in the MP include: Jon. 3.1 εκ δευτερου, Hag. 2.20 εκ δευτερου, Zech. 4.12 εκ δευτερου, 6.2 τω δευτερω. The relative relationship between וַיֵּאָת and לִשְׁנִית was likely inferred. The presence of אֲשֶׁר in the *Varlage* is unlikely.

εκαλυπτετε δακρυσι το θυσιαστηριον κυριου και κλαυθμω και στεναγμω εκ κοπων. כִּסּוֹת דִּמְעָה אֶת־מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה בְּכִי וְאֲנָקָה מֵאֵין

The second person of the Greek is derived from εποιειτε. There is no good reason to change the infinitive כִּסּוֹת to תִּכְסֶּי as suggested by BHS. But of some considerable interest is the rendering εκ κοπων. This would probably represent the translator's rendering of מֵאֵין. Elsewhere in the

MP, אֵין is rendered: Hos. 6.8 ματαια, 10.8 ὦν (Place name), 12.12(11) μη. .εστιν, Amos 5.5 ως ουχ υπαρχουσα, Mi. 2.1 κοπους, Hab. 1.3 κοπους, 3.7 κοπων, Zech. 10.2 κοπους. The confusion of אֵין and אֵין is clear in the cases of Hos. 12.12 and Amos 5.5. The logical implications of εκ κοπων are quite considerable. For whereas the Hebrew probably speaks in anticipation of vv. 14-16 of the treachery of the husbands against their wives for which reason Yahweh is angered and unresponsive to His supplicants, the Greek would clearly make the mourning the direct result of the hard labors of the people. Then the following interrogative clause necessarily converts the preceding into a concessive clause--"Yet, in

spite of your hardships and great grief over them, would it be right for Yahweh to receive favorably your offerings? Clearly then, the ταυτα at the beginning of the verse looks back to the previous 3 verses while the לִנְי of the Hebrew looks forward.<sup>53</sup>

ετι αξιον επιβλεψαι εις θυσιαν η λαβειν δεκτον εκ των χειρων υμων; The extra αξιον is simply a clarification by the translator. It stresses that not only does Yahweh not attend to such sacrifices or offerings, but that it would actually be unfitting for Him to do so.

14 και ειπατε Ενεκα τινος; οτι κυριος διεμαρτυρατο ανα μεσον σου και ανα μεσον γυναικος νεοτητος σου, ην εγκατελιπες, και αυτη κοινωνος σου και γυνη διαθηκης σου. 15 και ουκ αλλος εποιησε, και υπολειμμα πνευματος αυτου. και ειπατε Τι αλλο αλλ η σπερμα ζητει ο θεος; και φυλαξασθε εν τω πνευματι υμων, και γυναικα νεοτητος σου μη εγκαταλιπης· 16 αλλα εαν μισησας εξαποστειλης, λεγει κυριος ο θεος του Ισραηλ, και καλυψει ασεβεια επι τα ενδυματα αυτου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. και φυλαξασθε εν τω πνευματι υμων και ου μη εγκαταλιπητε.

17 Οι παροξυνοντες τον θεον εν τοις λογοις υμων και ειπατε Εν τινι παρωξυναμεν; εν τω λεγειν υμας Πας ποιων πονηρον, καλον ενωπιον κυριου, και εν αυτοις αυτος ευδοκησε· και Που εστιν ο θεος της δικαιοσυνης;

Translation: 14 And you say, Why? Because the Lord has borne witness between you and between the wife of your youth whom you have forsaken. And she is your partner and the woman of your covenant. 15 And no other made *her*, indeed a remnant of His spirit. And you say, What other than a seed does God seek? And watch over your spirit, and do not abandon the wife of your youth. 16 But if you hate *her* and send *her* away, says the Lord God of Israel, ungodliness will also cover *his* garments, says the Lord Almighty. And watch over your spirit and do not forsake *her*.

17 Oh you who are provoking God with your words--and you say how have we provoked *Him*? In that you say, Everyone doing evil is good before the Lord and He is well-pleased with them, and where is the God of righteousness?



14 ἣν εγκατελίπες מַבּוּ הַתַּלְבַּע הַחֵן רָשָׁן See discussion of Mal. 2.10.

15 καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος ἐποίησε, καὶ υπολείμμα πνεύματος αὐτοῦ. תַּחֲנֹנִי

הַשֵּׁנ This is surely a case where the original reading is not found

amongst a great number of the most important manuscripts. οὐ καλὸν B,

N\*, 68; οὐ καλῶς N<sup>ca</sup>, 410 534. However, there can be little doubt that

the original οὐκαλλος came to be shortened by haplography to οὐκαλος.

For ἄλλος is a fairly clear misreading of the Hebrew--תַּחֲנֹן read as תַּחֲנֵן.

(Cf. Ex. 33.5, I Ki. 14.4,5, II Ki. 7.23, III Ki. 18.6(2x),23, Ezek. 19.5). The

Greek and Hebrew of this passage are both rather incomprehensible. Yet

one ambiguity of the Hebrew is not shared by the Greek. For תַּחֲנֵן/תַּחֲנֹן

was read as the subject of the verb, whereas the Hebrew at least allows

the possibility that תַּחֲנֵן is the object. Whereas the Greek is a rather

unilluminating and slavish rendering of the Hebrew, we need not discuss

its possible meaning in detail. On the whole, the translator was content

to pass on the text in its incomprehensibility.

καὶ εἶπατε Τι ἄλλο ἀλλ ἡ σπέρμα ζητεῖ ὁ θεός;

וְכִנְיָן מִכֶּשֶׁת דַּע לְהִימָן

The translator has with his addition of καὶ εἶπατε given much help in

understanding his reading of this passage. For he, in putting this line in

the mouth of the people, betrays his understanding that it is an

expression of the foolishness or spiritual blindness of the people. The

Greek means that the people in self-justification argue that Yahweh's

sole concern is that the people have physical descendants.

16 ἀλλὰ εἰ μισήσας ἐξαποστείλῃς, כִּי-שָׂנֵא שָׂנֵא לָךְ



The MT probably states that if a man hates his wife, he is to divorce her

(שִׁלַּח = Piel imperative. Although the pointing could represent the

infinitive construct, it would not likely do so in connection with the form of the third person perfect. And one should assume that there is some measure of internal coherence in the vocalisation of the MT. Furthermore, there is no analogy for the infinitive construct of שִׁלַּח functioning as a grammatical absolute.) Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden."<sup>54</sup>

However, the pointing of the MT is regarded by most commentators as impossible, making nonsense of the whole passage. So Baldwin states, *For I hate divorce, says the Lord.* English Versions agree that this is the prophet's meaning, even though the Hebrew in fact reads 'if he hates send (her) away', a sense found also in the ancient Versions. Evidently the text suffered early at the hands of some who wanted to bring Malachi's teaching into line with that of Deuteronomy 24:1, which permitted divorce. Such a reading undermines all that the prophet is seeking to convey.<sup>55</sup>

This view is not as obvious as often implied. The verbal parallels with that ultimate passage on divorce, Deut. 24.1-4, are substantial. (כַּעַל vv.1,4 שִׁלַּח vv. 1,3,4 שֹׁנֵא v. 3). This type of lexical sharing more likely demonstrates an original harmony of thought rather than a late correction or assimilation. And perhaps in the difference between the treachery of בָּגַד and the legislated protections implicit in שִׁלַּח there is room for the reading of the MT.<sup>56</sup> And that a divorce might have represented in ancient Israel a much desired freedom for the unloved wife is clearly suggested in Deut. 21.14 where the man who loses interest in his captive bride is instructed "to send her away wherever she desires" וּשְׁלַחְתָּהּ לַנִּפְשָׁהּ (cf. KB p. 976 where לַנִּפְשָׁהּ is viewed to mean "wohin sie will.")

The imperative of the MT is represented in a number of Greek

manuscripts: εξαποστειλον W', Q<sup>cb</sup>, L' -<sup>36</sup>, 86<sup>mg</sup>, 576, Th., Tht. This might, of course, represent assimilation toward the Hebrew. Yet it is also possible that the subjunctive form merely reflects the force of the εαν or the interests of the scribes to soften the text. For it must be clearly stated that the text αλλα εαν μισησας εξαποστειλης is in no way a justification of divorce. The Vulgate and the Targums do indeed instruct one who hates his wife to divorce her, but the Greek says no such thing. For it can be regarded as certain that in its proximity to εαν, there is absolutely no chance that εξαποστειλης is a hortatory subjunctive. It is clearly a conditional clause. And the consequences of divorce, as suggested in the following clause, are unambiguously negative.<sup>57</sup>

και καλυπει ασεβεια επι τα ενδυματα αυτου וכסה חמם על-לבשו

The reading ενδυματα is very poorly attested (only in 410, Ethiopic and Arabic). Elsewhere one finds the form ενθυμηματα. Because ενδυματα is a common rendering for לבשו, most commentators regard ενθυμηματα as simply an inner-Greek corruption. Vollers, on the other hand, argues that ενθυμηματα is original and based on an Aramaic root בנש, while ενδυματα is a later correction toward the Hebrew. He states:

Das ל fiel aus wegen des vorangehenden על und S. las ein Derivat von בנש, ביש aramaisierend. Zu ενθ. etc. in diesem Sinne cf. Soph. OT 739; Trachin. 109; Jer. 3,14; 7,24; Thren. 2,17 Ps. 9,25 (10,9) Sy., Hiob 42,2 (οι αλλοι); Ez. 14,23; Ps. 119,118; Hiob 21,27 Sy. Epictet εγχερ. c. 21; Sap. Sal 3,14; Matth. 9,4; 12,25; Hebr. 4,12; Poll. Onom. II 231; P u. T machen wahrscheinlich, dass die Stelle undeutlich geschrieben war; sie scheinen für על: ל zu lesen. ενδυματα (Georg.) is Correctur.<sup>58</sup>

However, it must be noted that in most instances where the thoughts are clearly evil, there is a qualifier or context which makes that clear: Jer.

3.17 πονηρας, 7.24 κακης; Ps. 9.24 ο αμαρτωλος, 119.118 αδικον;  
 Enchiridion 21 ταπεινον; Sap. Sol. 3.14 πονηρα. Surely we would expect a  
 πονηρας or κακης here if the Aramaic root were in mind. Furthermore,  
 that there occurred an early corruption in the Greek text was already seen  
 in the case of ουκ αλλος of the previous verse. If ενδυματα is original,  
 then the Greek has passed on (without comment, perhaps without  
 understanding) the principal ambiguity of the Hebrew. However, it should  
 be noted that the Greek regards  $\text{מְבַרֵךְ}$  as the subject of the verb while in  
 the Hebrew it is more likely the object. The Greek means that if a man  
 hatefully sends away his wife (in divorce), he will inevitably be causing  
 himself or perhaps his wife to be covered with ungodliness.<sup>59</sup>

17 Οι παρωξυνοντες τον θεον εν τοις λογοις υμων και ειπατε Εν τινι  
 παρωξυναμεν; εν τω λεγειν υμας Πας ποιων πονηρον, καλον ενωπιον  
 κυριου, και εν αυτοις αυτος ευδοκησε και Που εστιν ο θεος της δικαιοσυνης;  
 This is the only instance (2x) where παρωξυνω apparently renders any  
 form of  $\text{עָלָה}$ . Elsewhere the Hiphil of  $\text{עָלָה}$  is rendered: Isa. 43.23 εγκοπον  
 εποιησα, 24 προσκτης μου (as though a form of  $\text{עָלָה}$ ) The semantic shift  
 is rather substantial. The Hebrew merely means "put to work," "to make  
 weary" while the Greek means "to provoke" or "exasperate." Perhaps the  
 Greek is a conscious strengthening of the verbal idea with remembrances  
 of Hos. 8.5 παρωξυνθη ο θυμος μου επ αυτους and Zech. 10.3 επι τους  
 ποιμενας παρωξυνθη ο θυμος μου.

The participial construction reflects the translator's interest to create a  
 vocative force in anticipation of the dramatic introduction of τον  
 αγγελον μου. The direct address is left suspended for what seems an  
 impossible length of text until it and the interrogative Που are

dramatically resolved with  $\delta\theta\upsilon$ . This is high drama. Suggestions of a different *Varlage* such as  $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\gamma\iota\epsilon\iota\mu$  or  $\delta\eta\gamma\epsilon\iota\mu$  are unconvincing.<sup>60</sup>

## Chapter 3

1 ιδου εγω εξαποστελλω τον αγγελον μου, και επιβλεψεται οδον προ προσωπου μου, και εξαιφνης ηξει εις τον ναον κυριος, ον υμεις ζητειτε, και ο αγγελος της διαθηκης, ον υμεις θελετε· ιδου ερχεται, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. 2 και τις υπομενει ημεραν εισοδου αυτου; η τις υποστησεται εν τη οπτασια αυτου; διοτι αυτος εισπορευεται ως πυρ χωνευτηριου και ως ποια πλυνοντων. 3 και καθιεται χωνευων και καθαριζων ως το αργυριον και ως το χρυσιον· και καθαρισει τους υιους Λευι και χεει αυτους ως το χρυσιον και ως το αργυριον· και εσονται τω κυριω προσαγοντες θυσιαν εν δικαιοσυνη.

Translation: 1 Behold, I am sending forth My messenger, and he will survey a way before Me. And suddenly the Lord will come into the temple, even He whom you seek, even the messenger of the covenant, whom you desire. Behold, He comes, says the Lord Almighty. 2 And who will endure the day of His entrance? Or who will withstand at His appearance? For He is entering as fire of a furnace and as an herb of cleaners. 3 And He will sit refining and cleansing like silver and like gold. And he will cleanse the sons of Levi and will pour them like gold and like silver. And they shall offer to the Lord a sacrifice in righteousness.

1 **וַיִּפְנֶה דָּרָךְ לִפְנֵי** It is clear that the translator read the verb as the Qal.  
 פִּנָּה : דָּרָךְ : לִפְנֵי

Dingermann states, "Im Piel hat פִּנָּה nie die Bedeutung 'blicken, schauen'.

An 30 Stellen gibt die LXX aber das Kal von פִּנָּה mit επιβλεπειν, sodaß es sicher ist, daß man auch hier die Vokale des Kal vorausgesetzt hat.<sup>61</sup>

What is not so clear is why he would do that. The meaning of the verb in the Piel ("to clear") is much more suitable for the context. The Piel of פִּנָּה occurs in:

Gen. 24.31 ητοιμασα, Lev. 14.36 αποσκευασαι, Isa. 40.3 ετοιμασατε, 57.14 καθαρισατε? or more likely απο προσωπου (=פִּנָּה instead of פָּנָה), 62.10  
 פִּנָּה=οδοποιησατε, Zeph. 3.15 אִי־כֶךְ פִּנָּה=λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος

ἐκθρων σου (as though פָּדָה) Although it would be possible to argue that the translator understood the Piel of Zeph. 3.15 and was rendering the Hebrew very loosely, it is more likely, in view of the probable substitution of a form of פָּדָה, that the translator did not understand the verb in Piel. And interestingly, the translator of the MP viewed the noun פָּנָה ("corner, corner-stone") as a verb and rendered it with ἐπεβλεψε in Zech. 10.3(4). It appears to be the case that the translator found the form פָּנָה inscrutable, whether verb or noun.<sup>62</sup>

אֱלֹהֵיכֶלָּו εἰς τὸν ναόν The translator has omitted the pronoun. He probably judged it to be superfluous.

διότι αὐτὸς εἰσπορεύεται ὡς πυρ χωνευτηρίου καὶ ὡς ποῖα πλυνόντων.  
כִּי־הוּא פֶאֶשׁ מִצֹּרֶף וּכְבֹרִית מְכַבְּסִים

Dingermann (and BHS) suggest that the Greek εἰσπορεύεται reflects a Hebrew פֶּאֶשׁ which fell out of the MT because of homoioteleuton (בְּאֵשׁ אֲבִיבָהּ) This is possible but unlikely. The Greek verb is easily explained as an addition based on the earlier הִנֵּה־בֶאֱשׁ (εἶδου ἐρχεται) or בֹּאֲיוֹ (εἰσοδου αὐτοῦ). Furthermore, the reconstructed text has the serious disadvantage of shifting the figure from a description of the Lord in his judgment to a description of his entrance. And neither a refiner's fire nor fullers soap is an apposite simile for someone's entrance. χωνευτήριον is a "smelting-furnace" (LS p. 2014). The Hebrew form מִצֹּרֶף is the Piel Part. of צֹרֶף and means "a refiner." It is possible that the translator thought of the noun מִצֹּרֶף, which has the expected meaning "crucible," yet in its two

occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, it is apparently rendered καμινω (Prov. 17.3) and δοκιμιον (Prov. 27.21). The translator of the MP rendered with χωνευτηριον two other times when the word was quite unexpected in Zech. 11.13 και ειπε κυριος προς με Καθες αυτους εις το χωνευτηριον, και σκεψομαι ει δοκιμον εστιν, ον τροπον εδοκιμασθην υπερ αυτων. και ελαβον τους τριακοντα αργυρους και ενεβαλον αυτους εις τον οικον κυριου εις το χωνευτηριον. In this verse χωνευτηριον is apparently rendering צִיִּיָּה ("the potter"). However, many commentators (and BHS) imagine an original Hebrew צִיִּיָּה "the treasury" (supported by the Syriac) to be required in the context. It could be that the translator is simply fond of the Greek word and that he freely inserted it into a semantic gap created by what he viewed to be the nonsensical "potter." And this free insertion might well have been influenced by its (exegetically-motivated?) connection with the form צִיִּיָּה "he who casts metals." In Mal. 3, the translator is probably just stressing the location of the fire rather than the one who uses the fire. His rendering of the same word in the next verse is predictably χωνευων.

ως το αργυριον και ως το χρυσιον This is simple assimilation toward the second half of the verse צִיִּיָּה וְכֶסֶף.

4 και αρεσει τω κυριω θυσια Ιουδα και Ιερουσαλημ καθως αι ημεραι του αιωνος και καθως τα ετη τα εμπροσθεν. 5 και προσαξω προς υμας εν κρισει και εσομαι μαρτυς ταχυσ επι τας φαρμακους και επι τας μοιχαλιδας και επι τους ομνυοντας τω ονοματι μου επι ψευδει και επι τους αποστερουντας μισθον μισθωτου και τους καταδυναστευοντας χηραν και τους κονδυλιζοντας ορφανους και τους εκκλινοντας κρισιν προσηλυτου και τους μη φοβουμενους με, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

This verse in the Greek has so many additions that it would be useless to



Translation: 4 And the sacrifice of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord just as in the ancient days and just as in the former years. 5 and I will come before you in judgment and I will be a quick witness against the sorceresses and against the adulteresses and against the ones swearing by My name falsely and against the ones withholding the wage of the hireling and the ones oppressing the widow and the ones beating the orphans and the ones averting justice from the proselyte and the ones who do not fear Me, says the Lord Almighty.

ἐπι τὰς φαρμακοὺς καὶ ἐπι τὰς μοιχαλίδας מִכְשָׁפִים וְכַמְנָאִפִּים

The translator has switched the genders of the two words. It is not clear that the feminine of φαρμακος occurs elsewhere in the LXX. In Exodus 22.17 the Hebrew מִכְשָׁפָה לֹא תַחֲיֶיהָ is rendered with the ambiguous φαρμακοὺς οὐ περιποιήσετε. Elsewhere, the word is unambiguously masculine. It must be imagined that the translator thought that the women were particularly guilty of these two sins. The word μοιχαλὶς means "adulteress," yet it has gathered up some associations particularly in reference to the fact that this woman has displaced her superior. Cf. Prov. 18.22b (only in Greek) ὅς ἐκβάλλει γυναῖκα ἀγαθὴν, ἐκβάλλει τὰ ἀγαθὰ· ὁ δὲ κατεχὼν μοιχαλὶδα ἀφρων καὶ ἀσεβής. and Prov. 30.20-21 & 23a τοιαυτὴ ὁδὸς γυναικὸς μοιχαλίδος· ἡ ὅταν πράξῃ, ἀπονισαμένη οὐδὲν φησὶν πεπραχέναι ἀτοπὸν· διὰ τριῶν σείεται ἡ γῆ, τὸ δὲ τέταρτον οὐ δύναται φερεῖν. . .καὶ οἰκετὶς εἰς ἐκβάλλῃ τὴν ἐαυτῆς κυρίαν. Although the Hebrew text makes no reference to the women who are involved in the treachery against the men's wives, the translator of the LXX was not willing to let their sins go unmentioned. Perhaps there is even the implication that they bewitched the men into their treacherous infidelities.

וְכַמְשָׁפִים לְשָׁקֶר καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁμνυόντας τῷ ὀνόματι μου ἐπὶ ψευδεῖ

This verse in the Greek has so many additions that it would be unwise to

imagine an original לשקר בשמי. The translator has already shown through the gender switch that he has something to contribute to the passage. In the additions of this verse, you have a lavish enrichment of the passage from similar passages and phrases elsewhere in the prophets.<sup>63</sup> This insertion is probably derived from Zech. 5.4 *εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ὀμνυόντος τῷ ὀνόματι μου ἐπὶ ψευδεῖ.*

*καὶ τοὺς καταδυναστεύοντας χηρὰν* The Hebrew verb לעשק can mean both "to defraud" and "to oppress." The Hebrew construction represents a zeugma where one sense of the word is required in reference to the first object (שֹׁכֵר) and another sense is required for the second and third (אֶלְמָנָה וַיִּתּוֹם). A very similar zeugma is found in Mi. 2.2 וַעֲשִׂקוּ גֵבֶר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וּנְחֻלָּתוֹ. In Mal. 3.5 the translator has simply eliminated the zeugma. The multitude of suggestions about how the MT might be rewritten only demonstrate the extent that zeugma and bold parataxis are unappreciated by modern readers. At a textual level, the suggestions are probably worthless.<sup>64</sup>

*καὶ τοὺς κονδυλιζοντας ὀρφανούς* The verb κονδυλιζω means to "beat with the fists" and thus suggests much more than mere neglect, but rather active hostility and abuse. This expression is probably borrowed from Am. 2.3 (LXX) *ἐκονδυλιζον εἰς κεφαλὰς πτωχόν.*

וּמַטִּי-גֵר *καὶ τοὺς ἐκκλινοντας κρίσιν προσηλύτου* The LXX translator has rightly judged that this Hebrew phrase must resume the logical force of the hostile כִּי of וּבַעֲשִׂקִי. Furthermore, he has filled in what is clearly

elided from the construction (חֲשִׁימ-cf. Isa. 10.2 εκκλινοντεςκρισιν).<sup>65</sup>

και τους μη φοβουμενους με יִנְיָנִי לֵאמֹר The translator, acting out of stylistic sensitivities, continues with the participial construction. The Hebrew's switch to the perfect tense signifies a circumstantial clause which qualifies all the preceding groups of offenders. The LXX views yet another group.<sup>66</sup>

6 Διοτι εγω κυριος ο θεος υμων, και ουκ ηλλοιωμαι· 7 και υμεις, υιοι Ιακωβ, ουκ απεχεσθε απο των αδικιων των πατερων υμων, εξεκλινατε νομιμα μου και ουκ εφυλαξασθε. επιστρεψατε προς με, και επιστραφησομαι προς υμας, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. και ειπατε Εν τινι επιστρεψωμεν; 8 ει πτερνιει ανθρωπος θεον; διοτι υμεις πτερνιζετε με. και ερειτε Εν τινι επτερνικαμεν σε; οτι τα επιδεκατα και αι απαρχαι μεθ υμων εισι· 9 και αποβλεποντες υμεις αποβλεπετε, και εμε υμεις πτερνιζετε· το εθνος συνετελεσθη. 10 και εισηνεγκατε παντα τα εκφορια εις τους θησαυρους, και εσται η διαρπαγη εν τω οικω μου. επισκεψασθε δη εν τουτω, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, εαν μη ανοιξω υμιν τους καταρρακτας του ουρανου και εκχεω υμιν την ευλογιαν μου εως του ικανωθηναι· 11 και διαστελω υμιν εις βρωσιν και ου μη διαφθειρω υμιν τον καρπον της γης, και ου μη ασθενηση υμιν η αμπελος εν τω αγρω, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. 12 και μακαριουσιν υμας παντα τα εθνη, διοτι εσεσθε υμεις γη θελητη, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

Translation: Because I am the Lord Your God, and I am not changed. 7 And you, O sons of Jacob, do not refrain from the iniquities of your fathers: you have perverted My statutes and you have not kept *them*. Return to Me, and I will return to you, says the Lord Almighty. And you say, How shall we return? 8 Will a man supplant God? For you supplant Me. And you say, How have we supplanted You? Because the tithes and first-fruits are among you. 9 And you surely look away, and you supplant Me. The nation is finished! 10 And you brought all the produce into the storehouses, but there shall be plunder in My house. Look now in this *matter*, says the Lord Almighty, whether I will open for you the floods of heaven and will pour out for you My blessing until you are satisfied. 11 And I will give

orders concerning food for you, and I will not corrupt against you the fruit of the earth. And the vine in the field shall not be weak against you, says the Lord Almighty.<sup>67</sup> And all the nations shall bless you, for you will be a desired land, says the Lord Almighty.

בִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה לֹא שֵׁנִיתִי 6 Διοτι εγω κυριος ο θεος υμων, και ουκ ηλλοιωμαι

The translator regards this verse with its introductory בִּי as an explanation of the preceding judgment. Most commentators on the Hebrew do not view the בִּי as causal in force. The parallel structure of 6a and 6b proves that in the Hebrew יְהוָה is not the predicate of אֲנִי but rather stands in apposition to it.<sup>67</sup> The Greek wrongly presents the clause as a predicate and fortifies the construction with ο θεος υμων.<sup>68</sup>

οὐκ ἀπεχέσθε ἀπο τῶν ἀδικιῶν לֹא כִלִּיתֶם לַמִּימִי The translator thinks of God's unchanging righteousness and the people's persistent sinfulness as virtually equally absolute. On the translator's interest to accentuate the people's sinfulness compare the discussion of Mal. 1.1 (and Zech. 1, f.n. #2). There have been several suggestions about how the translator might have misread the word כִּלִּיתֶם. Dinger mann states, "Die LXX haben כִּלִּיתֶם nicht von כִּלָּה sondern von 'כִּלָּא = verhindern, meiden' hergeleitet." (p. 234). Vollers opines, "S. las כִּלָּאתֶם oder כִּלִּיתֶם." (p. 77) It is unlikely that the error is merely one of sight. First, it must be noted that ἀπεχω never renders any form of כִּלָּה or כִּלָּא. In the MP כִּלָּה is rendered: Hos. 11.6 (Pi.) κατεπαυσεν, Amos 7.2 (Pi.) συντελεσση, Zech. 5.4 (Pi.) συντελεσσει. כִּלָּא is rendered: Hag. 1.10 2x (Qal) ανεξει, υποστελειται. It is interesting to notice the number of times that a form of כִּל is rendered with either συντελω (Hos. 13.2 כִּלָּה, Na. 2.1 כִּלָּה, Mal. 3.9 כִּלו ) or

συντελεια (Amos 8.8 בִּלְהָ 9.5 בִּלְהָ, Hb. 1.9 בִּלְהָ, 15 בִּלְהָ). This particular rendering is unique to the MP. It seems that either the feminine (הָ) or the old masculine form of the pronoun (הָ) on בִּלְ confused the translator. See Chapter 2 on the Kethib/Qere of Hos. 13.2, Na. 2.1, Hab. 1.9 & 15. But what seems quite clear in the case of Mal. 3.6 is that the mistaken rendering of 3.9 must have controlled the translation of verse 6. For inasmuch as the translator imagines that verse 9 states that "the nation is finished," it was hardly possible for him to think that verse 6 could be rightly understood to say that "the sons of Jacob are not at an end--not finished." So to remedy the contradiction, the translator intentionally read בִּלְיָתָם as though it were instead בִּלְיָתָם. Assuming the correctness of his view of verse 9 and being totally confident that the text could not contradict itself in such a blatant manner, he felt it quite within his rights as a translator of the sacred text to produce a different verb.

לְמִימֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם ἀπο τῶν ἀδικιῶν τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν Probably the translator read the first ך as a ך, thereby reading לְמִימֵי. The ease with which the two forms might be confused is seen in the translation of Job 11.15 כִּי־אֵין תִּשָּׂא פָנֶיךָ מִמּוֹם = οὕτως γὰρ ἀναλαμψεί σου τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς περ ὑδῶρ καθαρὸν. Obviously he is thinking of מִיִּם. And although the Hebrew מִיִּם is almost consistently rendered with its Greek counterpart μῶμος, the spiritualization of the concept can perhaps be seen in such a passage as Job 31.7 εἰ δὲ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶ μου ἤψαμην δῶρων. And if we can imagine that the translator's association of מִיִּם and δῶρον is still in mind five chapters later, then the specific lexical association of מִיִּם and ἀδικία can be inferred from the Greek of Job 36.18 θυμὸς δὲ ἐπ' ἀσεβείας

εσται δι' ασεβειαν δωρων, ων εδεχοντο επ' αδικiais.<sup>69</sup>

Θ εἰ πτερνιεῖ ἄνθρωπος θεόν; διότι υμεῖς πτερνίζετε με.

יִקְרַב עַד אֵלֶיךָ בִּי אֲתָם קִנְעִים אֲתָי

The Greek verb πτερνίζω means "to strike with the heel" or "to trip up, supplant." (LS p. 1546) Outside of Malachi, it is always a rendering of קָרַב : Gen. 27.36 επτερνικε [Ιακωβ] γαρ με ιδου δευτερον τουτο (Cf. 25.26 και η χειρ αυτου επειλημμενη της πτερνης Ησαυ), Hos. 12.3 εν τη κοιλια [Ιακωβ] επτερνισε τον αδελφον αυτου, Jer. 9.4(3) εκαστος απο του πλησιον αυτου φυλαξασθε, και επ' αδελφοις αυτων μη πεποιθατε, οτι πας αδελφος πτερνη πτερνιεῖ, και πας φιλος δολιως πορευσεται. [Jer. 9.4(3) is a very explicit allusion to Jacob. The Hebrew reads בִּי כִלְ-אֶת עֲקֹב יַעֲקֹב. The Hebrew verb would sound virtually identical to the name of the patriarch. In fact this homoiophony is the basis of Esau's statement in Gen. 27.36 "Is he not rightly named Jacob? for he has supplanted me these two times" (יַעֲקֹב וַיַּעֲקֹבֵנִי). That the allusion was not lost on the translator is clear from the next clause where the Hebrew רִכְלִי which means "as a slanderer" is rather tendentiously rendered with δολιως which adverb would immediately call to mind the guile or deception (δολος) of Jacob (Cf. Gen. 27.35 ειπε δε αυτω, ελθων ο αδελφος σου [Ιακωβ] μετα δολου ελαβε την ευλογιαν σου. Thus, the Greek verb πτερνίζω has such specific associations with Jacob that there can be little doubt that the υιοι Ιακωβ of verse 6 served as the inspiration of this paronomastic rendering. Although it is certain that intentional paronomasia is involved, some have maintained that an original קָרַב was altered to קִנְעִי perhaps "to avoid assonance to יַעֲקֹב." (KB p. 820). J. M. P. Smith argues against an original Hebrew paronomastic קָרַב with the following, "Not much stress may be

laid on the fact that **לַעֲקֹב** would furnish a pun on **בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב** of v. 6; for close connection between the two verses is broken by v. 7 and, furthermore, Mal. is not characterised by any effort after paronomasia." (p. 74) This is perhaps a bit overstated. Neither the length nor the content of verse 7 is an adequate cause for the author (or a translator or scribe) to have forgotten the audience of the address. But it is true that the Hebrew of Malachi does not reflect paronomastic interests. The LXX of the MP, on the other hand, reflects paronomastic translation throughout. This fact, the high level of intentionality observed in the translation of the immediately preceding context, the fine suitability of the Hebrew verb **קָבַע** as indicated by its only other occurrence in Prov. 22.23, and the greater difficulty of the MT in view of the rarity of the verb all suggest that the **קָבַע** of the MT is original and the bold paronomasia is the work of the clever translator of the LXX.

οτι τα επιδεκατα και αι απαρχαι μεθ υμων εισι **הַמַּעֲשֵׂר וְהַתְּרוּמָה**

There is a good chance that the *Vorlage* of the LXX differed from and was superior to the MT at this point. As Dingermann states:

Der Schluß des Verses ist am besten mit LXX als **כִּי הַמַּעֲשֵׂר וְהַתְּרוּמָה בָּכֶם**  
 כִּי הַמַּעֲשֵׂר וְהַתְּרוּמָה בָּכֶם

(cf. KB) zu lesen, כִּי konnte im MT durch Haplographie mit dem

vorausgehenden כִּי verloren gehen und בָּכֶם vor den folgenden כִּי leicht übersehen werden.<sup>70</sup>

It is, of course, quite possible to argue that the translator has simply filled in the gaps of the highly elliptical Hebrew.<sup>71</sup> But when one puts the reconstructed LXX *Vorlage* in its context, it looks suspiciously as though the MT reflects corruption. **קָבַענוּכֶםהַמַּעֲשֵׂר וְהַתְּרוּמָהבְּכֶםמֵאָרֶה**

<sup>70</sup> Dingermann, *op. cit.* 100. The text actually reads more fluently than the original



9 και αποβλεποντες υμεις αποβλεπετε, και εμε υμεις πτερνιζετε· το εθνος συνετελεσθη. בְּמֵאֵרָה אַתֶּם נֹאֲרִים וְאֵתִי אַתֶּם קִבְּעִים הַגִּי' בְּלֹ

The first clause appears to be a translation of בְּמֵאֵרָה אַתֶּם רֹאִים. It is quite probable that the translator was not familiar with נֹאֲרִי in the Niphal (this is its only occurrence) and simply rewrote the text through intentional metathesis and the deletion of the ך of נֹאֲרִים. If the translator read the root "to curse" but did not know it in the Niphal, then he well might have imagined that the verbal action was active and that וְאֵתִי did double-duty between 9a and 9b. If that were the case, then he would very likely have altered the text to avoid a blasphemous construction. It is also possible that the translator was somewhat confused by the abrupt Hebrew syntax and assumed a continuation of the explanation of verse 8 and could not understand the sharp disjunction between 9a and 9b.

το εθνος συνετελεσθη. הַגִּי' בְּלֹ The Greek verb συνετελεσθη is best explicable if we understand the *Variante* of the LXX to have had the older masculine suffix בְּלֹ. In view of the widespread interchange between the forms in K/Q, this is the best explanation. But it would not be out of the question to consider the possibility of homoiophonic translation.<sup>72</sup> The noun εθνος is very poorly attested [A\*, O (Q<sup>mg</sup>, Syh<sup>txt</sup>)]. Virtually the entire manuscript tradition has instead ετος. This reading likely reflects a scribe's learned and intentional alteration of the passage based on the word's obvious resemblance to his parent text's εθνος but also in view of the perfect suitability of the word ετος in the context. For the text with ετος states very coherently that the crop year is over (and all harvesting) and the produce is in the barns, yet Yahweh is going to plunder it if they do not repent. The text actually reads more fluently than the original

Greek. This is both the mark of lateness and intentionality.

10 και εισηνεγκατε παντα τα εκφορια εις τους θησαυρους, και εσται η διαρπαγη εν τω οικω μου.

הביאו את־כל־המעשר אל־בית האוצר ויהי מרף בביתי

This text has been dramatically reworked. First, the imperative has been altered to the indicative. Secondly the word המעשר is tendentiously translated as εκφορια, and finally the word מרף is rendered with διαρπαγη which means "plundering." The renderings המעשר/εκφορια and מרף /διαρπαγη are both without parallel. In the MP, מעשר is elsewhere rendered predictably with επιδεκατος (Ma. 3.8 & Amos 4.4). Inasmuch as the word מעשה can refer to the produce of the ground, it is conceivable that the translator deliberately chose to read the word המעשר as המעשה. Although מעשה is never elsewhere rendered with εκφοριον, a close semantic association is perhaps implicit in Hab. 3.17 διوتي συκτη ου καρποφορησει, και ουκ εσται γεννηματα (יבול) εν ταις αμπελοις ψευσεται εργον ελαιας. (פחש מעשה־זית) And εκφοριον renders יבול in Jd. 6.4 and in Hag. 1.9. The other occurrences of the word מרף in the MP are: Am. 3:4 θηραν; Nah. 2:12 θηρας, 13 θηραν; 3:1 θηρα. The word διαρπαγη emphatically accentuates the extreme violence to be experienced. Thus, it is unlikely that all the differences in this verse should be regarded as the *Fehlerkonsequenz* of a simple misreading of מרף.<sup>73</sup> For it should be noted that in those instances in the Hebrew, where the context demands the minority nuance of the Hebrew word, the LXX translators seem to have no difficulty--Ps. 111:5 (τροφην); Prov. 31:15 (βρωματα); Job 24:5 is disrupted both in the Hebrew and Greek and is not instructive here.

Furthermore, the translators have not chosen the rendering which in the MP is expected for מַלְאִכָּה --namely θηρα.

But whatever the precise reasons for the specifics of the differences in the clause, the overall effect of the changes is quite obvious. The apparent meaning of the Hebrew is that if Israel will only bring in the required tithes, God will surely open his floodgates and will pour forth all the material blessings associated with the messianic age. His return (v. 7) is thus concretely conditioned upon their faithfulness in tithing. J. M. P. Smith, in an often-contested statement, stresses the rather

mechanistic and unspiritual nature of the passage. He states,

That the prophet should condition the bestowal of Yahweh's favour upon the payment of the tithe alone is surprising. To be sure, this act would in itself indicate a change of attitude toward God, without which there could be no manifestation of his favour. Nevertheless, the prophet's conception of the nature of religion is evidently less ethical and spiritual than that of his great predecessors, viz. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. It is inconceivable that they could have represented Yahweh as contented with the performance of any single act, least of all one in the sphere of ritual.<sup>74</sup>

This statement has been criticized by Verhoef who objects, "Malachi's appreciation of the cult is nowhere abstracted from the covenant relationship of the people, and is therefore strictly religious and also prophetically legitimate! The testing of God is an aspect of their return to him."<sup>75</sup> It is probable that Smith has overstated his point slightly. The passage in context would not suggest that Yahweh would be contented with "the performance of any single act." But the text surely does suggest that Yahweh will respond to faithfulness in the area of tithing by ushering in the messianic age with all its grandeur and prosperity. For as Verhoef states,

We agree with Von Bulmerincq that the terms of the promise include an eschatological aspect in addition to the concrete element. The same relationship between abundance of rain and the future fertility of the promised land is found in Isa. 30:23; 44:3; Joel 2:23; Zech. 10:1;



Job 23.10<sup>1</sup>; Ps. 17.3<sup>3\*</sup>; 66.10<sup>3</sup>; 95.9<sup>3\*\*</sup>; Jer. 6.27<sup>3</sup>; 9.7<sup>3</sup>; 12.3<sup>3</sup>; Zech. 13.9<sup>3</sup>; Mal. 3.15<sup>5</sup>; Zech. 13.9<sup>3</sup>; Ps. 26.2<sup>3</sup>; 139.23<sup>2</sup>; Mal. 3.10<sup>6</sup>; Job 7.18<sup>2</sup>; 12.11<sup>1</sup>; 34.3<sup>3</sup>; Ps. 11.4<sup>7</sup>, 5<sup>7</sup>; 81.7<sup>3</sup>; 1 Chr. 29.17<sup>8</sup>; Ps. 7.9<sup>8</sup>; Prov. 17.3<sup>3</sup>; Jer. 11.20<sup>3</sup>; 17.10<sup>3</sup>; 20.12<sup>3</sup>; Gen. 42.15<sup>9</sup>, 16<sup>10</sup>; Job 34.36<sup>4</sup>; Eze. 21.13(18)<sup>11</sup>

1 διακρινω 2 κρινω 3 δοκιμαζω 4 μανθανω 5 αντιστημι  
6 επισκεπτομαι 7 εκτασσω 8 εταζω 9 φαινομαι 10 γινομαι φανερον  
11 απωθεω (Pass.)

\*Ps. 17.3 links δοκιμαζω and επισκεπτομαι in an interesting way!

\*\*Ps. 95.9 links δοκιμαζω and πειραζω but more importantly, it deletes the personal suffix which would have made God the object of בָּחַן.

The Greek verb επισκεπτω is almost always a rendering of the Hebrew בָּחַן.<sup>77</sup> In view of how many times both the Greek and the Hebrew verbs occur, this is significant. Furthermore, the Greek has deleted the personal suffix ("test me"). There are only three places where God is the object of the Hebrew verb בָּחַן: here, Mal. 3:15 and Ps. 95:9. Although Ps. 95:9 has the expected δοκιμαζω, you do not find the personal suffix me (in reference to God) represented by the Greek. In fact, the Greek really implies that God's works were being tested (ου επειρασαν οι πατερες υμων, εδοκιμασαν και ειδοσαν τα εργα μου). And in Mal. 3:15 we encounter the surprising και αντεστησαν θεω for גַּם בָּחֲנוּ אֱלֹהִים. It certainly looks like a resistance to the idea of man being able to "test God." Thus, it is very likely that we are dealing here with a reverentially tendentious translation.<sup>78</sup>

τους καταρρακτας του ουρανου ארבות השמים

The Hebrew word means "window" or "chimney". [Like the Ugaritic *úrbt*--"lattice, sluice"] However, the Greek rendering, which surely represents a metonymy, refers to the flood of blessing which will flow through such a window of heaven. The same rendering is found in Gen.

7.11; 8.2; 4 Ki 7.2, 19.<sup>79</sup>

καὶ ἐκχέω ὑμῖν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου ἕως ἰκανωθῆναι

וְהִרְקֹתִי לָכֶם בְּרִכָּה עַד־בְּלִי־יָדַי

Rudolph says, "Wörtlich: Bis es nicht mehr Bedürfnis ist." However, it is not clear that יָדַי ever means "need." It seems to always mean "sufficiency." BDB (p. 191) states, "I will pour out a blessing until there is not sufficiency, i.e. until my abundance can be exhausted, or, as this can never be, for ever." It is also possible that the meaning is that Yahweh will pour out a blessing until there is not adequate place for its storage. This meaning fits nicely in the context of the challenge to bring all the tithes into the storehouse. However, inasmuch as the first verb וְהִרְקֹתִי has connotations of "emptiness" (cf. adjective רֵיקָן "empty, vain"), the suggestion of BDB is to be preferred. So it is very likely that the translator of the LXX rightly judged the meaning of the Hebrew to be that Yahweh would give to the very limits of His resources. Thus, it is equally likely that the LXX represents a classic example of converse translation. For in looking at the occurrences of the adjective ἰκανός, one observes that it is a very common rendering of the Hebrew יָדַי. [See Ex 36.7; Lev 5.7; 12.8; 25.26,28; I Kings 18.30; IV Kings 4.8; Prov. 25.16, Ob. 1.5; Nah 2.12(13); Hab 2.13(?); Is 40.16] In other words, the translator of the MP has in our passage given a reading which might have been expected if there had been no negative בְּלִי. This is converse translation in classic form! The Hebrew represents an effective and provocative metaphor of quantity (cf. Ps. 72.7 וְרֵב שְׁלוֹם עַד־בְּלִי יָרֵחַ "and much peace until there is no moon"). The Greek, on the other hand, represents a more philosophically precise representation of the same general idea. But that philosophical or theological sensitivities were at work in the translation

seems certain.

It is no doubt in the context of this material change that we should view the insertion of the personal pronoun in the Greek. The μου makes explicit what is merely implicit in the Hebrew. But that emphasis on the close association of the blessing with Yahweh increases the impossibility in the mind of the translator of reading the Hebrew literally as it stands.

11 και διαστελω υμιν εις βρωσιν και ου μη διαφθειρω υμιν τον καρπον της γης, και ου μη ασθενηση υμιν η αμπελος εν τω αγρω, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

וְגִעַרְתִּי לָכֶם בְּאֵכָל The Hebrew means, "I will rebuke on your behalf the devourer." The meaning of the Greek is not as clear. There is a general rule that the active verb means "to separate, divide" while the middle voice means "to command." But there is some evidence that the distinctions of voice are not rigidly maintained in the papyri.<sup>80</sup> Thus the Greek should probably be viewed to mean, "I will give orders on your behalf concerning food." Vollers believes the Greek reflects a Hebrew וְגִעַרְתִּי. But the Hebrew verb גִּעַר means "to diminish, to take away." And it is unlikely that the Hebrew could have represented the meaning which Vollers imagines the Greek to have--"anweisen, zuteilen." Furthermore, it must be noted that the verb גִּעַר is never elsewhere rendered by διαστελλω. It is probably best to imagine that the translator is engaging in very free translation and that the clause should be translated as suggested by Brenton as meaning, "I will give charge for you to be fed." εις βρωσιν "for food" merely represents a free rendering of the preposition כ and a different vocalisation בְּאֵכָל rather than בְּאֵכָל.

וְלֹא־יִשְׁחַת לָכֶם אֶת־פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה και ου μη διαφθειρω υμιν τον καρπον της



γης The translator's treatment of בְּאֵכָל has obscured the natural subject of יִשְׁחַת, thus he really is somewhat compelled to alter the person of the verb.<sup>81</sup>

וְלֹא-תִשָּׁכַח לָכֶם הַגֶּפֶן בְּשׁוּדָה και ου μη ασθενηση υμιν η αμπελος εν τω αγρω ασθενεω is the standard rendering of בָּשַׁל, so it is very likely that the translator treated the form as תִּכְשַׁל. There is no other instance of ασθενεω rendering שָׁכַל. Elsewhere in the MP שָׁכַל is rendered: Hos. 9.12 ατεκνωθησονται, 14 ατεκνουσαν Mal. 3.12 is the only instance of this Hebrew verb having the meaning "to miscarry" while being applied to inanimates. The translator evidently did not appreciate the unusual expression.

Finally, it should be noted that the net effect of the differences in the Greek and Hebrew of the passage is once again that of deflating what would surely be highly eschatological language to the readers of the Hebrew. We must bear in mind that "locusts and vine are elements of the eschatological perspective (cf. Joel 2:11, 22; Hos. 14:8; Amos 9:13-15; Hag. 2:20; Zech. 3:10; 8:12)."<sup>82</sup> Thus the translator has reshaped both the explicit condition of verse 10a and the explicit eschatological blessing to result of vv. 10b-11. Inasmuch as there is no evidence of systematic alteration of the other passages which refer to eschatological fertility, it was probably the highly formulaic and specific construction of a concrete condition which would (according to his reading of the Hebrew) surely result in the blessing which the translator felt the need to obscure.

13 Εβαρυνατε επ εμε τους λογους υμων, λεγει κυριος, και ειπατε Εν τινι κατελαλησαμεν κατα σου; 14 ειπατε Ματαιιος ο δουλευων θεω, και τι

πλεον οτι εφυλαξαμεν τα φυλαγματα αυτου και διοτι επορευθημεν ικεται  
 προ προσωπου κυριου παντοκρατορος; 15 και νυν ημεις μακαριζομεν  
 αλλοτριους, και ανοικοδομουνται ποιουντες ανομα και αντεστησαν θεω και  
 εσωθησαν. 16 Ταυτα κατελαλησαν οι φοβουμενοι τον κυριον, εκαστος προς  
 τον πλησιον αυτου και προσεσχε κυριος και εισηκουσε και εγραψε βιβλιον  
 μνημοσυνου ενωπιον αυτου τοις φοβουμενοις τον κυριον και ευλαβουμενοις  
 το ονομα αυτου. 17 και εσονται μοι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, εις  
 ημεραν, ην εγω ποιω εις περιποιησιν, και αιρετιω αυτους ον τροπον  
 αιρετιζει ανθρωπος τον υιον αυτου τον δουλευοντα αυτω. 18 και  
 επιστραφησεσθε και οψεσθε ανα μεσον δικαιου και ανα μεσον ανομου και  
 ανα μεσον του δουλευοντος θεω και του μη δουλευοντος.

Translation: 13 You have spoken weighty words against Me, says the Lord.  
 And you say, In what way have we spoken against You? 14 You say, Vain  
 is the one serving God. And what advantage is there that we have kept His  
 ordinances and that we have walked as supplicants before the face of the  
 Lord Almighty? 15 And now we bless foreigners and those who do  
 lawless acts are built up and they stand in opposition to God and are  
 saved. 16 These things the ones fearing the Lord spoke against *Him*,  
 each one to his neighbor. And the Lord gave heed and heard and he wrote a  
 book of remembrance before Him for the ones fearing the Lord and the  
 ones reverencing His name. 17 And they shall be Mine, says the Lord  
 Almighty, in a day which I am making for an inheritance. And I will  
 choose them the way a man chooses his son who serves him. 18 And you  
 shall return and discern between a righteous man and a lawless man and  
 between the one serving God and the one not serving *Him*.

13 חזק עלי דבריכם Εβαρυνατε επ εμε τους λογους υμων

This Hebrew expression is also found in:

2 Sam. 24.4 ויחזק דבר־המלך אל־יואב ועל שרי החיל = και υπερисχυσεν ο  
 λογος του βασιλεως προς Ιωαβ και εις τους αρχοντας της δυναμεως and in  
 1 Chron. 21.4 ודבר־המלך חזק על־יואב = το δε ρημα του βασιλεως

εκραταιωθη επι τω Ιωαβ In Malachi, the precise meaning is probably "to  
 be so strong as to prevail over someone, thus "to wear someone out." The  
 translator opted for a unique rendering which is more in keeping with

Greek idiom. The change to the second person is simply part of the switch in idiom.<sup>83</sup>

14 ο δουλευων θεω עבד אלהים The translator read instead as עבד.

This vocalisation is shared by the Targums and the Vulgate.

και τι πλεον מה-בצע The only other occasions of this Hebrew noun in the MP are: Mic. 4.13 וחילם/כצעם = το πληθος αυτων/και την ισχυν αυτων and Hab. 2.9 רע לביתו בצע בצע ה' = ω ο πλεονεκτων πλεονεξίαν κακην τω οικω αυτου. [LS say of the question τί πλεον, "what *more*, i.e. what *good* or *use* is it?" (Note τί πλεον πλουτειν... παντων απορουντας) p. 1415]

τα φυλαγματα αυτου משמרתו as though משמרתו (Cf. Nu. 8.26 במשמרתם

However, it should be noted that every occurrence of the word φυλαγμα in the LXX is plural and in the case of those which correspond to a Hebrew word, the Hebrew is singular: Lev. 8.35, 22.9; Nu. 4.31 (וְאֵת מִשְׁמֶרֶת = ταυτα τα φυλαγματα); Deut. 11.1. And as is clearly seen in Nu. 4.31, it is not always the case that the translator might have simply vocalised the text differently. In fact, it is more likely that the translators simply viewed the Hebrew to represent a collective singular.

διοτι επορευθημεν ικεται וכי הלכנו קדרנית The Hebrew adverb קדרנית only occurs here. Yet, there can be little doubt that it derives from the cognate verb קדר and means "as mourners" (BDB p. 871). In the MP the verb קדר is rendered: Joel 2.10 ο ηλιος και η σεληνη συσκοτασουσι, 4.15 ο ηλιος και η σεληνη συσκοτασουσι, Mi. 3.6 και συσκοτασει επ αυτους η

ἡμερα. Vollers astutely observes that there is an analogous association of ideas implicit in the LXX's use of σκυθρωπος ("one with sullen countenance").<sup>84</sup> And of special interest is the fact that the verb σκυθρωπαζω ("to be of sad countenance") is several times used to render the verb קָדַךְ (Ps. 34(35).14; 37(38).6 and 41(42).9. The rendering in Mal. 3 is based on the metonymic shift from the attitude of humiliation and contrition (metaphorical extension of the idea of "darkness") to those who exhibit such an attitude--"the supplicants."

15 και νυν ημεις μακαριζομεν αλλοτριους ועתה אנחנו מאשרים זרים  
 αλλοτριος is a very common rendering of the participle of זָר, so זרים/זר.  
 Thus it is quite likely that the translator inadvertently read זרים as זרים.  
 He apparently does the same in 3.19 כל־זרים = παντες οι αλλογενεις. Cf.  
 Ps. 19.13(14) גם מִזִּדִּים חָשָׁךְ עֲבֹדָךְ = και απο αλλοτριων φεισαι του δουλου  
 σου. The adjective זָר is far too common to imagine that the translator  
 did not know the word. It should be noted, however, that there seems to  
 be the suggestion of a metaphorical view of "foreigner" in the Greek gloss  
 of Jer. 49(42).17. For in this suggestive passage, the Judeans forsaking  
 the land and fleeing to Egypt are interpretatively referred to as "the  
 foreign born." כל־האנשים אשר־שָׁמוּ אֶת־פְּנֵיהֶם לְבוֹא מִצְרַיִם לְגֹר שָׁם =  
 παντες οι ανθρωποι και παντες οι αλλογενεις, οι θεντες το προσωπον  
 αυτων εις γην Αιγυπτου ενοικειν εκει. . . While it is possible that as  
 suggested in BHS the Greek reflects a misreading of כל־הזרים which  
 was borrowed or perhaps displaced from 43.2 where הזרים is not  
 represented in the Greek, it is at least equally likely that the Greek of  
 49.17 reflects a double translation of the infinitive לָגֹר (οι αλλογενεις

and ενοικειν) and that the translator has absorbed the וְכָל־הַיִּדִּים of 43.2 into his view of οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς. And such a double translation would probably imply the translator's opinion that anyone who chose to live לַגֹּיִם in Egypt was really no better than one who is "foreign born" γλ/ἀλλογενεῖς. It would not be totally unexpected that the Jeremiah passage with its very emphatic view concerning those who went to Egypt might well have had a place of importance in the minds of the translators of the LXX. (And of course it might be argued that this negative attitude is counter-evidence against an Egyptian provenance for the LXX of Jeremiah.) While it does not appear that the translator of the MP develops any line of thought in Mal. which is based upon a metaphorical view of "foreigners," if the Jeremiah passage were well known it might have stimulated various types of hermeneutical musings on the basic formula יִדִּים = זָרִים. Whether the shift to ἀλλοτριους be intentional or unintentional, the effect on the passage appears to be that of altering what was originally an *innerjudische* matter with the result that the problem of faith becomes the apparent impunity of the "arrogant" heathen nations. The intention of the Hebrew is quite different.<sup>85</sup>

ἄνομα רְשָׁעָה The Greek is the plural, referring to concrete acts of lawlessness, while the singular Hebrew is the abstraction. This shift, while subtle, is related to the earlier τα φυλαγματα αὐτοῦ/מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ

ἀντεστήσαν θεῷ בָּחַנוּ אֱלֹהִים This is not simply free translation. Rather, it must be regarded as an expression of the translator's discomfort with the idea that man can בָּחַן Yahweh. The rendering is without parallel. See the discussion of v. 10.

16 Ταυτα κατελαλησαν וַיִּבְרְךְ יְיָ The Greek probably reflects a *Varlage* of וַיִּבְרְךְ תְּנִי. (cf. 2.13 תְּנִי = και ταυτα) Grabe's conjecture of an original τότε which was corrupted to ταυτα is to be rejected as totally lacking in external corroboration and for being overly simplifying. The overall effect of this slight textual difference is incredible. For while the MT would suggest that v. 16 introduces those who fear the Lord who evidently stand in distinction to those faithless agnostics of vv. 14 and 15, the LXX clearly suggests that it was those who fear the Lord (sharp irony ?) who spoke the outrageous statements which preceded.<sup>86</sup> And this meaning is even clarified by the addition of the prefix κατα of κατελαλησαν (cf. v. 13 וַיִּבְרְךְ עָלֶיךָ = κατελαλησαμεν κατα σου). The Peshitta also reflects the reading of the LXX.<sup>87</sup> J. M. P. Smith describes the meaning of the LXX (which he views to be the proper view of the Hebrew when properly restored with תְּנִי):

Yet in reality his thought is meant for the encouragement of the doubters to whom he has just been speaking. This rendering, based upon LXX S T, shows unmistakably that the words of vv. 14.15 are spoken by those who worship Yahweh. M, however, reads "Then spake together those who feared Yahweh, etc." Aside from a grammatical difficulty, this involves assigning the foregoing doubts to the godless in Israel, interpreting "the arrogant" as characterising the heathen, and leaving the words of the pious unrecorded.<sup>88</sup>

While admitting the uncertainties inherent in any consideration of the *lectio difficilior* of this passage, a few inconclusive remarks are in order. First, if our retroversion of תְּנִי is correct (so Dingermann), then the absence of any specific feminine antecedent might tell in favor of the LXX. Secondly, to put the outrageous language of vv. 14-15 into the mouths of those who "fear Yahweh" is perhaps to amplify the blasphemy

and to increase the affront to the divine majesty. And finally, the promises of blessings which follow in verses 16b-17 are difficult to square with such impudent language as that of vv. 14 & 15. In fact this difficulty is what is viewed to be absurdity or impossibility by many commentators. These three difficulties strongly suggest that the superficially smooth reading of the MT is later.<sup>89</sup> But if there is any coherence or sense in the Greek, then that text must be understood to suggest that while the day of Yahweh represents utter destruction for the αλλογενεις and the ποιουντες ανομα (v. 19), in the preparatory work of Elijah there remains the possibility of a spiritual restoration for those fearing Yahweh. And it is this profound spiritual restoration which will prevent their experiencing "utter destruction" (םרן v. 24). Thus, while the MT relates the promise of blessing both to existing distinctions within the community and the future ministry of Elijah, in the Greek the startling and unexpected promises of blessing are based solely on the purgatorial ministry of Elijah. And as is very clear, this alteration in focus (or essential message) is also supported by the interesting םרן/αλλοτριους, αλλογενεις renderings. These renderings (perhaps unintentionally ?) emphasize the fact that it is the Gentiles who are the object of Yahweh's destructive wrath, not a particular group of the Jewish community.

και εγραψε βιβλιον μνημοσυνου ויכתב ספר זכרון Read as though ויכתב.  
 .. γ ..

This difference in voice nicely illustrates the fact that there is little anti-anthropomorphic consistency in the ancient versions.<sup>90</sup>

και ευλαβουμενοις το ονομα αυτου ולחשבי שמו The other occurrences



of  $\text{לָּבַט}$  in the MP are: (Qal) Mic. 2.1  $\text{λογιζομενοι}$ , 3  $\text{λογιζομαι}$ ; Na.1.11  $\text{λογισμος}$ ; Zech. 7.10 (+  $\text{לָּבַט}$ )  $\text{μνησικακειτω}$ ; 8.17  $\text{λογιζεσθε}$ ; Amos 6.5  $\text{ελογισαντο}$ ; (Niphal) Hos. 8.12  $\text{ελογισθησαν}$ ; (Piel) Hos. 7.15  $\text{ελογισαντο}$ ; Jon. 1.4  $\text{εκινδυνευε}$  (anti-personification); Na. 1.9  $\text{λογιζεσθε}$ . It has plausibly been suggested that because the translator did not know the expression  $\text{לָּבַט}$  "to value, esteem" he thought instead of the form  $\text{לָּבַט}$ .<sup>91</sup> This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that in every occurrence of  $\text{לָּבַט}$  in the MP, it is rendered with  $\text{ευλαβεομαι}$  (Na. 1.7, Zeph. 3.12). Furthermore, the interjection  $\text{לָּבַט}$  is several times rendered with  $\text{ευλαβεομαι}$  as though derived from  $\text{לָּבַט}$  (Hab. 2.20, Zeph. 1.7 and Zech. 2.13(17)). However, it is conceivable that the translator with no thought of  $\text{לָּבַט}$  whatsoever simply assimilated toward the very similar passage in Zephaniah 3. For this passage also speaks of a future spiritual renewal of Yahweh's people and the language is remarkably similar:  $\text{και υπολειφομαι εν σοι λαον πραυν και ταπεινον, και ευλαβηθησονται απο του ονοματος κυριου οι καταλοιποι του Ισραηλ, και ου ποιησουσιν αδικιαν και ου λαλησουσι ματαια, και ου μη ευρεθη εν τω στοματι αυτων γλωσσα δολια, διοτι αυτοι νεμησονται και κοιτασθησονται, και ουκ εσται ο εκφοβων αυτους. (νν. 12 & 13)}$

17 και εσονται μοι, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, εις ημεραν, ην εγω ποιω εις περιποιησιν, και αιρετιω αυτους ον τροπον αιρετιζει ανθρωπος τον υιον αυτου τον δουλευοντα αυτω. 18 και επιστραφησεσθε και οψεσθε ανα μεσον δικαιου και ανα μεσον ανομου και ανα μεσον του δουλευοντος θεω και του μη δουλευοντος.

17 εις ημεραν, ην εγω ποιω εις περιποιησιν  $\text{לִי יִם אֱשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה לְבָלֵט}$

The Greek for "day" is anarthrous. See 4.1. Kaminka suggests the possibility that the rendering  $\text{περιποιησιν} / \text{לְבָלֵט}$  reflects dependence on

the LXX of Isa. 43.21 לִי יִצְרֵתִי עַם-יִזְוִי = λαον μου, ον περιποιησαμην.

This is highly unlikely inasmuch as the Greek of Mal. 3.17 (perhaps the Hebrew ?) speaks of "a day" which Yahweh will make as His inheritance. Unlike Isa. 43.21, the predication does not concern the people.<sup>92</sup>

και αιρετιω αυτους ον τροπον αιρετιζει ανθρωπος τον υιον αυτου τον

וחמלתי עליהם כאשר יחמל איש על-בנו העֹבֵד אֹתוֹ;

Dingermann (p. 236) suggests that the Greek verbs reflect a confusion with יהמל/חמדת. This is unlikely both with respect to the issue of a possible *Varlage* and with reference to a probable translation. In the MP, חמל is only rendered επεθυμουν (Mi. 2.2). And in no instance throughout the LXX is חמל rendered with αιρετιζω. Furthermore, there is no instance of the construction חמל + על. Thus one would be forced to imagine a vastly divergent *Varlage* which is without analogy in its rendering in the LXX. We must be dealing with free translation. The translator's willingness to depart from the natural meaning of חמל ("to have compassion for," "to spare") is clearly observed in the case of Zech. 11.5 וְרֹעִיהֶם לֹא יַחְמֹל עֲלֵיהֶם = και οι ποιμενες αυτων ουκ επασχον ουδεν επ αυτοις.

18 και επιστραφησεσθε και οψεσθε ושבתם וראיתם The LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate regard ושבתם as a separate and independent verb. It is probably more natural to find an adverbial ("again") force in the first verb. Cf. Zech. 5.1 και επεστρεψα και ηρα, 6.1 και επεστρεψα και ηρα but see Hos.

11.9 לֹא אָשׁוּב לַשַּׁחַת אֲפִרִּים = ου μη εγκαταλιπω του εξαλειφθηναι τον

Εφραιμ. Perhaps the translator read **כִּי־שָׁמַיִם** as **כִּי־שָׁמַיִם**.

(Chapter 4)

1 διότι ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα ἐρχεται καιομένη ὡς κλίβανος [καὶ φλέξει αὐτοὺς], καὶ ἐσονται πάντες οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ ποιοῦντες ἀνομία κάλαμη, καὶ ἀναψήσονται αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐρχομένη, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑπολειφθῇ ἐξ αὐτῶν ρίζα οὐδὲ κλῆμα. 2 καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα μου ἡλῖος δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἰασις ἐν ταῖς πτερυξίν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέλυσέσθε καὶ σκιρτήσετε ὡς μόσχαρια ἐκ δεσμῶν ἀνείμενα. 3 καὶ καταπατήσετε ἀνομίους, διότι ἐσονται σποδὸς ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἡ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

Translation: 1 For behold, a day comes burning like an oven and it will consume them, and all the aliens and all those who commit acts of lawlessness will be chaff. And the coming day will kindle them, says the Lord Almighty, and neither root nor branch will be left of them. 2 But for you who fear My name, the sun of righteousness will rise, and healing in its rays, and you shall come out and skip like calves released from bonds. 3 And you shall shall trample the lawless ones, for they shall be ashes under your feet in the day which I am making, says the Lord Almighty.

4.1 (3.19) ἡμέρα ἐρχεται **כִּי־שָׁמַיִם** The translator has maintained the anarthrous phrase of 3.17 (**לְיוֹם** = εἰς ἡμέραν). In that verse, we might have imagined that merely a question of pointing was at stake. However, when seen in relation to this verse we must conclude that the translator has deliberately rendered the phrase indefinite. Perhaps this is just another way the translator stresses the uncertainty of the timing of that great day. However, notice **כִּי־שָׁמַיִם** = ὡς κλίβανος. It is certainly possible that simple and inconsequential stylistic concerns are behind the anarthrous Greek.

και φλεξει αυτους Dinger mann suggests that this clause "dürfte eine Glosse zu και αναπει αυτους sein, die diesen Ausdruck erklären sollte, später aber an anderer Stelle in den Text geschrieben wurde." (p. 236) This is very possible. Yet, one need not imagine that a complicated series of dislocations ultimately led to the present position of the gloss. For it is very likely that the passage and gloss were written as follows:

διοτιιδουημεραερχεταικαιομενη ωσκληβανος  
 καιεσονταιπαντεςοιαλλογενειςκαιπαντες καιφλεξειαυτους  
 οιποιουντεςανομακαλαμη καιαναπειαυτους  
 ηημεραηερχομενηλεγεικυριοςπαντοκρατωρ  
 καιουμηυπολειφθηεξαυτωνριζαουδεκλημα

Clearly the gloss might have been incorporated into the text after κλιβανος very early in the history of the Greek text. Indeed, one cannot rule out the possibility that the translator himself interjected the clause as an afterthought. On οι αλλογενεις see the discussion of 3.15.

και αναπει αυτους η ημερα η ερχομενη נֶהְיָה יוֹם הַיָּמָה מְהֵלָּה

The Greek "day" is articular here. The correlation of מְהֵלָּה (Pi.)/αναπτω only occurs in the MP (Joel 1.19, 2.3 and here). Elsewhere מְהֵלָּה (Pi.) is rendered: Deut. 32.22 φλεξει, Isa. 42.25 οι συμφλεγοντες, Ps. 82(83).15 κατακαυσαι, Ps. 96(97).3 φλογιει, Ps. 105(106).18 κατεφλεξεν, Job 41.13 ανθρακες (free rendering). The uniqueness of the renderings in the MP and the frequency with which some form of φλεγω is employed outside the MP might strengthen the view that the earlier clause και φλεξει αυτους if indeed a gloss, did not derive from the translator himself. *often used with reference to a crushing military defeat* In II Kings 13:7b "The king of

και ου μη υπολειφθῃ ἐξ αυτων ριζα ουδε κλημα אשר לא יעזב להם שרש

וענף The translator read the verb as the Niphal-- יעזב The MT could

in fact represent an impersonal passive (So J. M. P. Smith, p. 84).

However, although the precise function of אשר is uncertain, there is some probability that it implies the nominal antecedent היום הבא which would then function as the implicit subject of יעזב. This would then represent an unusual instance of the Hebrew reflecting a rather high level of syntactical subtlety which is lost in the extremely paratactic rendering of the Greek.

4.2 (3.20) σκιρτησετε ως βοσχαρια εκ δεσμων ανειμενα ופשתם כעגלי

מרבק The differences between the Greek and Hebrew of this clause are

often blurred by an erroneous view of the meaning of the Hebrew verb

פוש. It is widely assumed that the verb means "to spring about" (BDB p.

807) or to "(playfully) paw the ground" (KB p. 756). Almost all

commentators view the verb this way. And this meaning is clearly

deduced from the corresponding renderings of the LXX. In fact, the verb

פוש only occurs three times in the Hebrew Bible (four times if one reads

נפשו of Na. 3.18 as the Niphal of the root. BHS suggests reading instead

נפצו.) In Jer. 50.11 the Q reads כי תפושו כעגלה דשה = (27.11) διότι

εσκιρτατε ως βοδια εν βοτανη. The Hebrew means "for you pawed (or

stomped) as a trampling (threshing) young heifer." In this Hebrew

sentence one would naturally assume the rough synonymy of פוש and

דש. And the emphasis of both verbs would be on the damage caused,

rather than the exuberance of the heifer. The verb דש is often used with reference to "a crushing military defeat." So II Kings 13.7b "The king of

Traditional Hebrew Text does an excellent job of both Jer. 50.11 "You

Syria had destroyed them, and had made them like the dust by threshing כַּעֲפָר לְדָשׁ; Amos 1.3 "For three transgressions of Damascus, and for four, I will not turn away *the punishment* thereof; because they have threshed גִּלְעָד Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" and Hab. 3.12 "You marched through the land in indignation, you threshed תִּדְרֹשׁ the nations in anger."

But it should be noted that BHS suggests reading instead כַּעֲגָלִי בְדֶשָׁא "like heifers in new grass." This conjectured Hebrew would be quite naturally rendered by the Greek. However, one must reckon with the probability that the Greek reflects the translator's lack of knowledge of the root פִּיֵּשׁ (thus palaeographically tendentious translation) and/or that the translator is simply translating כַּעֲגָלָה דֶשָׁא very freely. For the animal being compelled to thresh does not have much freedom to enjoy the βοτάνη. Thus upon release from the implicit confinement, the animal might be expected to "skip for joy in the grass."

Furthermore, in Hab. 1.8 where פִּיֵּשׁ is used to describe the "terrible and dreadful" horsemen of the Chaldeans, it is stated וַיִּפְשׁוּ פָרָשָׁיו = καὶ ἐξέπρασσονται οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ. This inane translation "the horsemen shall ride forth" does not demonstrate the translator's knowledge of the root פִּיֵּשׁ whatsoever.<sup>93</sup> And there can be no doubt that the essential function of the warhorse in the ancient world was to trample down the foot-soldiers.<sup>94</sup> Something of this nature is probably intended in the passage. Thus, when one considers that in Mal. 4, verse 3 very unambiguously defines the meaning of פִּיֵּשׁ in this context--"and you shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet"--one can only conclude that in 2b the Greek translator has gone his own way and taken most modern commentators of the Hebrew text along with him. In my estimate The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text does an excellent job of both Jer. 50.11 "You

stamped like a heifer treading grain" and of Mal. 3.20 "You shall go forth and stamp like stall-fed calves." Perhaps their rendering of Hab. 1.8 is less precise "Their steeds gallop--their steeds come flying from afar."

εκ δεσμων ανειμενα מרבק If as KB (p. 564) suggests this Hebrew word is derived from a root which means "to tie fast," then our translator simply demonstrates his knowledge of the fact.<sup>95</sup> For although the derivative meaning of "fattened" was surely understood, the primary significance of being bound could not apply to this calf which has come forth and is threshing the ground. Thus the translator is simply making explicit what is implicit in the Hebrew. This suggests that Dingermann's proposed *Varlage* מרתוק is quite pointless. The other occurrences of the word are rendered: I Sam. 28.24 δαμαλις νομας, Amos 6.4 και μοσχαρα εκ μεσου βουκολιων γαλαθηνα, Jer. 46(26).21 בקרבה בעגלי מרבק = εν αυτη ωσπερ μοσχοι σιτευτοι τρεφομενοι εν αυτη. This breakdown shows that the idea of confinement ranges from implicit (Jer. passage) to explicit (Amos and Mal.) The I Sam. rendering might rather suggest "free-ranging." But as is clear from that passage, the animal was in the house. Thus, νομας must not have its normal associations. The translator's tendency to make explicit verbal ideas (particularly of motion) which the Hebrew leaves implicit is seen in Mal. 1.12 και τα επιτιθεμενα εξουθενωνται βρωματα αυτου.

3(21) υποκατω των ποδων υμων תחת כפות רגליכם Surely Dingermann exaggerates when he states, "כפות macht sehr stark den Eindruck einer späteren Ergänzung und ist daher w. mit LXX zu streichen (vgl. Sellin,



Komm. 564)." (p. 236) "The soles of the feet" is absolutely stock Hebrew idiom. But because the expression is not as common in Greek, the translators often rendered without *ιχνη*. (Cf. Gen. 8.9, Deut. 28.56, Jos. 3.13, 4.18, Job 2.7, Isa. 1.6).

4 και ιδου εγω αποστελλω υμιν Ηλιαν τον Θεσβιτην πριν ελθειν ημεραν κυριου την μεγαλην και επιφανη, 5 ος αποκαταστησει καρδιαν πατρος προς υιον και καρδιαν ανθρωπου προς τον πλησιον αυτου, μη ελθω και παταξω την γην αρδην. 6 μνησθητε νομου Μωυση του δουλου μου, καθοτι ενετειλαμην αυτω εν Χωρηβ προς παντα τον Ισραηλ προσταγματα και δικαιωματα.

Translation: 4 And behold, I am sending to you Elijah the Thesbite before the great and glorious day of the Lord comes; 5 who will restore the heart of a father to the son and the heart of a man to his neighbor, lest I come and smite the earth utterly. 6 Remember the law of Moses My servant, just as I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, *even* commandments and ordinances.

The dislocation of verse 6 should probably be understood to reflect a hesitance to end the book (and the Greek OT) with such a dire threat. The interest to tone down the passage might also be reflected in the deletion of the idea of the *בא* ("ban, utter annihilation"). The adverb *αρδην* lacks the concrete associations of *בא*. This softening of the final passage might be viewed as the antecedent to the instructions in the Massora to repeat the next to last verse of Malachi, Isaiah, Lamentations and Qoheleth. The harshness of the concluding verses of these books was judged an inappropriate conclusion for a synagogue reading.

Ηλιαν τον Θεσβιτην אֱלִיָּה הַתְּשִׁבִּי Dinger mann rightly notes that אֱלִיָּה הַתְּשִׁבִּי and אֱלִיָּה might have been confused through "einen Hörfehler." (p. 237).

Yet, it is also possible that as Verhoef suggests the rendering of the LXX reflects the translator's view "that the historical prophet Elijah will return in person." (p. 340) Thus the Greek would be clarifying that it would not be a prophet like Elijah, but the actual historical Elijah the Thesbite who would come. It is also possible that the translator is simply assimilating toward the common designation (1 Kings 17.1; 21.17,28; II Kings 1.3,8; 9.36).

וְהָשִׁיב לִב־אֲבוֹת עַל־בָּנִים ὅς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρός πρὸς υἱόν

This Greek clause reflects simple stylistic variations. The relative pronoun is smoother than a simple καὶ and the switch to distributive singulars accentuates the universal character of the restoration. And although the rendering שׁוֹיֵב (Hi.)/ἀποκαθίστημι is very common outside the MP, it never elsewhere occurs within the MP and the verb has in several contexts explicit eschatological overtones. As H. -G. Link notes:

While *apokathistemi* is found but rarely in the preaching of the early prophets (e.g., Amos 5:15; Hos. 2:5[3]; 11:11), it has a special theological significance in the announcement of eschatological salvation in exilic and post-exilic prophecy. Yahweh will bring Israel back from exile into his own land (Jer. 16:15; 23:8; 24:6). Ezekiel draws a parallel between the eschatological restoration of Israel and his beginnings (Ezek. 16:55), and Mal 4:6 (3:24) prophesies of the » Elijah *redivivus* who will turn the hearts of fathers and sons towards each other again. Thus in the LXX *apokathistemi* becomes more and more the term for the eschatological, and in part messianic, hopes of Israel for restoration of her former state.<sup>96</sup>

Similarly, Glazier-McDonald states:

The influence of the LXX ἀποκαταστήσει gave rise to the further expectation that Elijah was to be an agent of restoration, in some sense, as well as repentance. This can be seen in the work of Ben Sira. In his 'Praise of the Fathers,' he gives one section to Elijah (48:1-12). Verses 1-9 are based on I Kgs 17f and v. 10 on Mal

3:23-24:

Who are ready for the time, as it is written,  
To still wrath before the fierce anger of God,  
To turn the heart of the fathers unto his children,  
And to restore the tribes to Israel.

In Ben Sira 48:10c, d the two explanations of הָשִׁיב which have been noted in the MT and LXX are found side by side. The Hebrew of Ben Sira retains the הָשִׁיב of the MT and translates the ἀποκαταστήσει of the Greek back into Hebrew as הָשִׁיב, 'to (re)establish, (re)-constitute, restore.' This suggests that the idea of restoration, based on the LXX rendering, is already firmly established.<sup>97</sup>

και καρδιαν ανθρωπου προς τον πλησιον αυτου It is difficult to determine the precise intention of this gloss. It is possible that the translator judged the previous reference to fathers and sons to be insufficiently pertinent to the domestic problems mentioned in the book. Thus his intent might have been "and the heart of man toward his "lover, paramour." (Cf. Cant. 1.9 τη ιππω μου εν αρμασιν Φαραω ωμοιωσα σε, η πλησιον μου and verse 15 Ιδου ει καλη, η πλησιον μου). However, this is admittedly a rare use of πλησιον. It is far more likely, as is suggested in 3.5 with the comprehensive list of offenses for which Yahweh will judge His people, that the translator wants to clarify that the future spiritual restoration will not merely alter things in the domestic/familial sphere but indeed in the general social order. Thus the scale of the restoration has been enlarged.

μη ελθω και παταξω την γην αρδην פִּן־אֵבֶל וְהַפִּיתִי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ חֲרֵם

The Hebrew construction is elliptical. The instrumental force of חֲרֵם is simply deduced from the passage. Thus it is possible that it was the elliptical nature of the Hebrew which accounts for the adverbial rendering αρδην. In fact, BDB (p. 356) suggests that the adverbial sense

is virtually equivalent to the instrumental ("Mal 3<sup>24</sup> *smite the land with a ban*, i.e. utterly destroy it.") However, there is another reasonable explanation of the Greek. First, it should be noted that there is an almost stereotypical rendering of  $\square\aleph$  in  $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ . In the MP, the renderings of  $\square\aleph$  (verbal form,  $\square\aleph$  1 and  $\square\aleph$  2) are: Mi. 4.13 (Hiphil)  $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\omega$   $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$  [It is possible that Lev. 27. 28 & 29, where one also finds this rendering and in immediate proximity to the noun  $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ , served as the precedent for the rendering. In Lev. 27.21 one also finds the unique rendering  $\square\aleph$  /  $\alpha\phi\omicron\rho\iota\zeta\omega$ .  $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  could also be a homoiophonic translation based on the similarity with  $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ .]; Zech. 14.11  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$   $\sigma\upsilon\kappa$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$   $\epsilon\tau\iota$ ; Mic. 7.2  $\square\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  =  $\epsilon\kappa\theta\lambda\iota\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$   $\epsilon\kappa\theta\lambda\iota\beta\eta$  Glazier-McDonald draws attention to the remarkable similarity of Mic. 7.2, where as in Mal. 4 the instrumental force is deduced from the passage  $\square\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ .<sup>98</sup> There is considerable debate among commentators concerning which root is represented in this passage. Yet it does seem probable that the translator read  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  as  $\aleph\aleph$ . The Geminative root  $\aleph\aleph$  is often rendered with  $\epsilon\kappa\theta\lambda\iota\beta\omega$  or  $\theta\lambda\iota\beta\omega$ . There is no instance of the verb rendering  $\aleph$  "to hunt."<sup>99</sup>; Hab. 1.15  $\alpha\mu\phi\iota\beta\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\omega$ , 16  $\sigma\alpha\gamma\eta\eta$ , 17  $\alpha\mu\phi\iota\beta\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ . This breakdown shows three things: 1. The translator knew the specific or technical significance of  $\square\aleph$  (so Zech. 14.11). 2. The translator probably recalls the promise of Zech. 14.11 that in the eschatological future there would no longer be a threat of  $\square\aleph$ . 3. The translator consistently renders unpredictably when  $\square\aleph$  (whatever root) is involved in an non-explicit instrumental construction (so Mi. 7.2 and Mal. 4.5). Thus, the Greek of Mal. 4.5 is probably either a reflection of

the peculiar Hebrew syntax of the verse or an attempt to obscure a perceived contradiction between Zech. 14.11 and Mal. 4.5.

<sup>1</sup>Thus argues Verhoef (p. 156), "Hence the LXX's rendering, 'his messenger,' may be only a different form of the Hebrew word, *mal'ki yahu*, in the sense of 'messenger of the Lord.' The *yod* is taken as a *yod compaginis*, as is the case in '*ahdi*' (1 Chr. 6:44), '*ahdi*'*el* (1 Chr. 5:15; cf. '*ahd*'*el*, Jer. 36:26), and *buqqi* (Num. 34:22; Ezra 7:14) compared with *buqqi'yahu* (1 Chr. 25:4, 13)." Cf. Rudolph pp. 247-8. However, J. Alberto Soggin, objects against this view, "A reconstruction of the name as a theophoric name compounded with a Yahwistic element (*mal'aki-yahu*\*) is extremely dubious, quite apart from the fact that such a name is not attested in the Hebrew Bible." Introduction to the Old Testament: From its origins to the closing of the Alexandrian canon, 3rd ed. trans. by John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989), p. 401. It was the view of Theodore of Mopsuestia that Μαλαχίας was simply equivalent to ἀγγελος. [Ὄνομα δε τω προφητη, κατα μεν την Ελληνων γλωτταν, Ἀγγελος· κατα δε την Εβραιων, Μαλαχίας] Migne P.G. LXVI (p. 597). This view is shared by Cyril of Alexandria, ... Μαλαχίας ος δη καλειται και Ἀγγελος, διερμηνευεται γαρ ωδε Μαλαχίας. Pusey (p. 546).

<sup>2</sup>It can be argued that the reworking of Zech. 1 does not stop at the accentuation of the force of the prophetic message, but actually goes so far as to write out the people's repentance from verse 6. Although there is some question about who is being referred to in the verse, and while the plain sense of the Hebrew does create an apparent tension with verse 4, there are no substantial grounds for imagining that the Hebrew verb שׁוּב means anything other than that which it means in its other occurrences in the immediate context (vs. 3 שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי = επιστρεψατε προς με, vs. 4 וְאַשׁוּב אֵלֵיכֶם = και επιστραφησομαι προς υμας, vs. 4 שׁוּבוּ נָא = αποστρεψατε). Thus the Greek και απεκριθησαν και ειπαν probably represents a contextually-inspired, theologically-motivated change in the meaning of the text. שׁוּב in Qal does not mean to answer. In the Hiphil, it sometimes means to return a response. However, in these instances, it almost always has an object (אֲמַרִים מִלִּין דְּבַר). In those instances where the object is not mentioned, the person receiving the address is always indicated (אֵל ל) The only possible exception to this rule is Prov. 26.16 "a sluggard is wiser in his own eyes than . . . מְשִׁיבֵי טַעַם. It is however, probably best to take the final noun as the object of the

participle ("seven who return a tasteful response") rather than as an attributive qualifier of the participle ("seven who respond tastefully").

<sup>3</sup>Rudolph, p. 247 f.n. #1.

<sup>4</sup>J. M. P. Smith, p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>Stekhoven, p. 106. He also suggests homoiophony in the cases of Amos 7.9 כַּמֹּות / βωμοι, Mi. 1.6 and Zech. 14.4 גַּ' / χάος, Nah. 1.6 נַתְכָה / τηκει, Nah. 2.2 מַפִּיץ / εμψυσων

<sup>6</sup>On the nature of homoiophony see "Homoeophony in the Septuagint" by G. B. Caird in Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 74-88. Of the translator of the LXX of Isaiah, he states:

Pride of place, both for quantity and for quality, undoubtedly goes to the translator of Isaiah with his ten examples, which include several of the most striking ones (1, 3, 4, 12, 19, 24, 42, 45, 53, 55). This translator still remains the biggest enigma in the Septuagint, consistent only in being erratic. It is tempting to say of him that his sole qualification for the task he undertook was that his ignorance of Hebrew was nicely balanced by the poverty of his Greek. Yet this verdict is too severe. For though he constantly mistranslates, it must be said in defence of his scholarship that he frequently does so deliberately. Homoeophony is not with him, any more than it is with others, a symptom of incompetence, but a mark of enterprise, one of the tools by which he wrings from a difficult text a sense not only vivid but apposite for the times in which he himself is writing." (p. 88)

<sup>7</sup>Verhoef, p. 203.

<sup>8</sup>See Thackeray p. 79, "The same preference for the short radical vowel appears in πομα (like ποσις: class. πωμα), δομα, χυμα (class. χευμα), and so apparently κριμα κλιμα. Words in -μα and -σις had come to be used with little, if any, difference of meaning (e.g. δομα, δοσις), and it was natural that they should be formed on the same pattern." Cf. LS p. 444.

<sup>9</sup>Ralph Smith, p. 304 f.n. #3a



<sup>10</sup>W. E. Barnes, p. 3. Cf. Dingermann p. 227 "...nicht δωματα ... Das der Übersetzer hier an נתן gedacht hat, scheint mir sicher zu sein." Ziegler concerning Kittel's suggesting a connection with the root נון replies, "LXX εἰς δωματα = MT, von נתן = δίδωμι abgeleitet. נון bzw/ נאה übersetzt das Dodekapropheton mit νομή, vgl. Am 1 2 Soph 2 6, mit ωραιον Joel 1 19.20 und mit πείδιον Joel 2 22." in "Studien zur Verwertung der Septuaginta im Zwölfprophetenbuch," ZAW 60 (1944) p. 115.

<sup>11</sup>At the present time there is no widespread consensus concerning the best terminology in describing various types of figures of speech. If one were to use Bullinger's massive study as the standard, then we are dealing with a zeugma or syllepsis. Under "Zeugma" in reference to Ex. 3.16 he states:

It may be that the verb פָּקַד (*pachad*), though used only *once*, should be repeated (by implication) in another sense, which it has, *viz.*: "I have surely visited (*i.e.*, *looked after* or *cared for*) you, and [*visited*] (*i.e.*, *punished for*) that which is done to you in Egypt)." The two senses being to *go to* with the view of helping; and to *go for or against* with the view of punishing, which would be the figure of *Syllepsis (q.v.)* (p. 132)

Under "Syllepsis" he states, "This name is given to the figure when only *one* word is used, and yet it takes on *two* meanings at the same time. (p. 296) Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated, E. W. Bullinger, D.D., 1898 (reprinted 1968 by Baker Book House Company). Bullinger's study while certainly dated is still unsurpassed.

<sup>12</sup>Beth Glazier-McDonald, Malachi: The Divine Messenger, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 98 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), p. 33.

<sup>13</sup>Both the Targums and the Peshitta reflect a Hebrew verb רוש which means to be poor (See Gelston, p. 184). If the Hebrew root רוש is established, then there is no reason to imagine as did Vollers that the Greek represents an Aramaicism. He argued, καταστραπται = רושנני aramaisierend, da die hebr. Form wahrscheinlich zu רוש 'arm sein' zu stellen ist." (p. 74)

<sup>14</sup>While there is no shortage of explicit "damn Edom" language in the Hebrew OT (see esp. Ralph Smith, pp. 305-306), there is some evidence of heightened bitterness in the Greek text of Obadiah. The Hebrew of vs. 13 is:

אֶל־תִּבּוֹא בִשְׁעֵר־עַמִּי בְּיוֹם אִידִם אֶל־תִּרְאֶה גַם־אֶתָּה פֶּרַעַתוֹ בְּיוֹם אִידוֹ  
וְאֶל־תִּשְׁלַחֲנָה בְּחִילוֹ בְּיוֹם אִידוֹ

The Greek, on the other hand reads: μηδε εισελθης εις πυλας λαων εν ημερα πονων αυτων μηδε επιδης και συ την συναγωγην αυτων εν ημερα ολεθρου αυτων μηδε συνεπιθη επι την δυναμιν αυτων εν ημερα απωλειας αυτων. While there are several interesting elements in the Greek of this verse, of decisive significance is the rendering of the last clause. For while the Hebrew very much allows one to imagine that Edom's crime was to watch from a distance while Nebuchadrezzar sacked Jerusalem, and then at a later time to steal away with some of the spoils, the Greek has a very different idea. For μηδε συνεπιθη επι την δυναμιν αυτων surely must be translated "you should not have joined forces against their army." This statement implicates Edom in direct military complicity in the sacking of Jerusalem.

There can be no doubt that in certain sections of the LXX, Edom is the object of an intense vilification which exceeds all historical plausibility. For it is surely very unlikely that it was the Edomites rather than the Babylonians who burned the temple in Jerusalem as suggested in I Esdras 4.45 τον ναον ον ενεπυρισαν οι Ιδουμαιοι, οτε ηρημωθη η Ιουδαια υπο των Χαλδαιων [For rabbinic parallels see Louis Ginsberg, The Legends of the Jews Vol. 6 (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1928), p. 405. Also cf. Judith 7: 8, 18]. There is, however, some evidence of Edomite cooperation with Nebuchadrezzar. So Burton MacDonald states, "Two Hebrew ostraca discovered by Y. Aharoni at Tell Arad in southeastern Judah also testify to Edom's power ca. 700-600 B.C. One ostrakon, which may be associated with the campaign of Sennacherib in 701, refers to some sort of negotiations between Judahite and Edomite authorities. The other deals with the urgency of gathering men in anticipation of an Edomite attack, possibly associated with one of Nebuchadrezzar's campaigns." In Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1982), s.v. "Edom" p. 20, by Burton MacDonald. Thus the intensified language of the LXX might reflect a genuine, albeit exaggerated historical reminiscence.

<sup>15</sup>Verheof, p. 206.

<sup>16</sup>Budde, p. 19. J. M. P. Smith agrees, "Add אִידִם, with LXX<sup>No.</sup> a HP. 22,36,51, 62,68,86 mg., Targ, Eth., Arm.; so Jer., Dort, Smend, We., Now., Marti, Siev., Bu., Dr., Or., van H., Hal., Du.<sup>Pro.</sup>." (p. 42)

<sup>17</sup>So Rudolph, p. 259.

<sup>18</sup>Vollers, p. 74.

<sup>19</sup>Ephesians 2: 18 has the similar nominal clause τὴν προσαγωγὴν . . . πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. However, the implied verbal force behind προσαγωγή is probably intransitive.

<sup>20</sup>Verhoef, p. 216.

<sup>21</sup>"Dum enim sacramenta violantur, ipse cuius sunt sacramenta violatur." For a similar concept cf. Ezek. 20.9,14,22 [although a different Hebrew verb (ללל) is used].

<sup>22</sup>G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets Commonly Called the Minor Vol. 2, The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), p. 356 fn. \*1.

<sup>23</sup>Rudolph p. 259, Verhoef p. 208 and Stekhoven p. 84.

<sup>24</sup>Nigel Turner states, "This represents a definite event as occurring only once in the future, and conceived as taking place before the time of the action of the main verb. It is expectation, but not fulfilment as yet. It is very near the meaning of ὅταν, and is often more than mere probability (see LXX Isa 24<sup>13</sup> *when*; Am 7<sup>2</sup>). In the apodosis occurs fut. and pres. indic., or imper. or jussive." (p. 114). Cf. BAGD p. 211.

<sup>25</sup>Gerhard Friedrich, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Vol. 6 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1968), art. by Lohse, pp. 779-80.

<sup>26</sup>For a good discussion of the expiation/propitiation debate see The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown, Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1978), art. by Colin Brown, pp. 148-60. The Hebrew expression חלה פנים is discussed in Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, ed. G. J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, Vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1980), art. by Seybold, pp. 407-9.

<sup>27</sup>Gelston, p. 151.

<sup>28</sup>J. Alberto Soggin rightly cautions: Leonhard Rost (ZLZ 101, 1976, 179f.) has criticized the fact that the

book does not devote enough attention to the problems of Hebrew metre (cf. below, 6.4). That is certainly true. However, I have to admit that I have never succeeded in understanding, far less in applying, the various methods proposed, foremost among which is that formulated at the beginning of this century by E. Sievers. The reasons are simple; what is involved here is studying the metre of a language which has been transmitted in a vocalization which is certainly not original, and derives from some centuries after the original writings, even if it is based on an authoritative tradition. Nor do we possess the original texts, but texts which have gone through many hands, manipulated and commented on to meet the needs of the believing community, and the product of many re-readings. And in addition to the vocalization, we know nothing about the original accentuation or about the division of words into syllables. Moreover even those responsible for the vocalization in the second half of the first millennium CE do not seem to have had any recollection of a metrical reading. And above all, it should be noted that we cannot even know whether there ever was such a reading, and the suspicion arises that the presupposition is based solely on the analogy of ancient Greek and Latin poetry; but here too, as is well known, we are in a phase of substantial revision. . . . For all these reasons I reject conjectures and emendations for the sake of metre, which often appear in critical editions and commentaries. (Preface to his Intro pp. X-XI) Cf. pp. 71-72, esp. "There are even sound reasons for supposing that as early as the Hellenistic period Hebrew metre was no longer known: otherwise certain additions would be inexplicable."

<sup>29</sup>Verhoef, pp. 220-1 fn.59.

<sup>30</sup>Dingermann, p. 229.

<sup>31</sup>Maurice Wiles states, "This prophecy of Malachi, so the Fathers believed, had been fulfilled in the spread of the Christian Church throughout the Gentile world. More particularly the pure offering of which Malachi had spoken was to be seen in the Christian eucharist now celebrated in different places all over the known world." The Christian Fathers, 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1977), p. 129. But as Perowne cautions, this view did not necessarily imply that the material accouterments of Christian worship were specifically in view. As he states:

It has been supposed that by the *offering*, or *minchah*, of this verse, the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are intended. But if that be the case we have here a prophecy of the universal offering of literal

*incense* also; for by no sound canon of interpretation can we give a material sense to one (*offering*) and a figurative sense to the other (*incense*) of two words which are thus placed by a writer in the same category. And then it follows that incense is as necessary a part of Christian worship, as 'the bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.'

It has been too hastily assumed that the early Christian writers put this interpretation on the *minchah* here foretold. Justin Martyr, for example, affirms that Almighty God in this passage declares by anticipation His acceptance of those who offer the sacrifices prescribed by Christ, that is to say 'those sacrifices which in the eucharist of the bread and cup are offered by Christians in every part of the earth.' But he presently makes it clear that it is not the bread and cup themselves that he means. 'I too assert,' he says, 'that prayers and giving of thanks, offered by worthy worshippers, are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God. And these alone moreover have Christians learned to offer even in the memorial of their dry and liquid sustenance, in which too the remembrance is made of the passion which for their sakes the Son of God endured.' (*Dial. cum Tryp.* §177.) (pp. 20-21)

The earliest explicit Christian exposition of the passage is that found in the Didache 14:

Κατα κυριακην δε κυριου συναχθεντες κλασατε αρτον και ευχαριστησατε, προεξομολογεσασμενοι τα παραπτωματα υμων, οπως καθαρα η θυσια υμων η. πας δε εχων την αμφιβολιαν μετα του εταιρου αυτου μη συνελθετω υμιν, εως ου διαλλαχωσιν, ινα μη κοινωθη η θυσια υμων. αυτη γαρ εστιν η ρηθειςα υπο κυριου· Εν παντι τοπω και χρονω προσφερειν μοι θυσιαν καθαραν. οτι βασιλευς μεγας ειμι, λεγει κυριος. και το ονομα μου θαυμαστον εν τοις εθνεσι. This passage which conflates Mal. 1.11 & 14 reflects a rather sacrificial approach to the Eucharist. Yet, the ethical dimension is clearly stressed. The present infinitive προσφερειν, which has an imperatival force in this context, obscures the general present tense temporal orientation of the original passage and allows for the possibility of a non-historical reading.

<sup>32</sup>Gelston, p. 146. He notes the omission of the word from the Targums but wrongly implies its presence in the Greek. Against Dingermann's suggestion that the form was wrongly read as a Niphal of נִבֵּן, thus επιτιθεμενα, it need only be mentioned that in the MP επιτιθημι is never used to render any form of נִבֵּן and the translator has



a clear tendency to fill in such verbal ideas which the Hebrew leaves implicit. Cf. Mal. 4.2(3.20) *ὡς βοσχαρια ἐκ δεσμων ἀνειμένα*.

<sup>33</sup>Concerning the difference of vocalization between the MT and the Peshitta, Gelston concludes:

It is clear also that the translator(s) vocalized the text in a number of passages in a way different from that of the traditional Masoretic vocalization. It is also probable that the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta or its ancestor contained rather less *scriptia plena* than M.T. This does not necessarily suggest that what was to become the traditional vocalization was not yet in existence, though it does suggest that it was not normative at the time when the Peshitta translation was made, at least in the circle of the Peshitta translator(s).

Nevertheless it is possible that some of these apparent differences in reading or vocalization may be due to the translator's interpretative licence or to the influence of another ancient version (especially the LXX) rather than to an actual divergence of the *Vorlage* from MT." (p. 125).

<sup>34</sup>As Verhoef notes, "The Vul. and Targ. concur with the MT. The LXX and Pesh. read the first person singular: 'And I will blow against it.' Thus they change the meaning: instead of the priests showing contempt for the offerings, it is the Lord who shows contempt for the offerings." (pp. 209-10).

<sup>35</sup>Cf. MM (p. 217), "In P Petr II. 25 (ⲉ) <sup>12</sup> *εἰς ἵππον ἐνοχλούμενον* = 'for a sick horse.'"

<sup>36</sup>Gelston, p. 165.

<sup>37</sup>Baldwin, p. 231.

<sup>38</sup>J. M. P. Smith, p. 45.

<sup>39</sup>Dingermann states, "Dass diese Doppelungen vom Übersetzer selbst stammen, ist ausgeschlossen, da es sich um 2 Dubletten handelt, die ihre Vorlage nicht in einem durchlaufenden Text haben. Urspr. haben diese wohl am Rand gestanden, und ein späterer LXX-Bearbeiter hat sie vereint, durch καὶ verbunden und in den Text aufgenommen." (p. 231)

<sup>40</sup>Perowne states: "The LXX. (reading *וְיָרֵעַ* for *וְיָרֵעַ*) render, ἀφορίζω

υμιν τον ωμον, 'I set apart for you the shoulder,' that being the part of the victim reserved for the priest. Lev. vii.34." (p. 22) It is curious that none of the passages dealing with the shoulder offering actually uses the word ωμος. Instead one finds βραχιων. ωμος usually refers to human shoulders. But the word does refer to the upper shoulder of an animal in Ezekiel 24.4 where the stress seems to be upon the delectable quality of the pieces. [και εμβαλε εις αυτον τα διχοτομηματα, παν διχοτομημα καλον, σκελος και ωμον εκσεσαρκισμενα απο των οστων] Furthermore, Moulton and Milligan provide two good examples from the papyri where ωμος refers to the shoulders of animals: "Cf. P Cairo Zen III. 59381<sup>3</sup> (iii/B.C.), where amongst other articles of meat we read of ---ωμος α σκελος α, and Syll 633 (= <sup>3</sup> 1042)<sup>18</sup> (ii/iiiA.D.) for the same combination in connexion with a sacrifice." (p. 701)

<sup>41</sup>The expected κοπος in every other instance of the Hebrew פָּרַשׁ surely weakens the force of Stekhoven's suggestion that we are merely dealing with euphemism in Malachi 2 (p. 81, However, he quite correctly notes the euphemism of Na. 3.5 שְׁוִלֶיךָ "your skirts" = τα οπισω σου). Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Syro-Hexapla reflect the expected κοπον. Furthermore, they reflect an instrumental reading of "arm" which is quite different from the thought of the LXX. [ιδου εγω επιτιμω υμιν συν τω βραχιονι]. Obviously they have retained the meaning of the Hebrew פָּרַשׁ.

<sup>42</sup>On the rendering of the verb פָּרַשׁ, Verhoef's judgment is interesting. He states, "The main problem with the reading of the LXX is the accompanying verb, *aphorizo*, in the sense of 'set apart,' 'separate.' In the LXX this Greek verb is used as a translation of fifteen different Hebrew words, but never *gada*'. The Greek translators obviously conjectured the meaning of the Hebrew text, and consequently provided an inconsistent translation." (p. 242) If, however, our reconstruction of the thinking of the translator be correct, then αποριζω is used entirely because of the shaping influence of Exodus 29. There is certainly no question about the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew verb פָּרַשׁ (Cf. Na. 1.4 απειλων, Zech. 3.2 επιτιμησai (2x). On the surprising rendering of Mal. 3.11 διαστελω, see below.

<sup>43</sup>Compare: Am. 4.2 ομνυει Κυριος κατα των αγιων αυτου διοτι ιδου ημεραι ερχονται . . .



Joel 3. 17 και επιγνωσεσθε διوتي εγω Κυριος ο θεος υμων

Jon. 1.12 (N\*) διوتي εγνωκα εγω διوتي δι εμε ο κλυδων. . .

Zeph. 2.9 διατουτο, ξω εγω, λεγει Κυριος των δυναμεων ο θεος Ισραηλ, διوتي Μωαβ ως Σοδομα εσται. . .

Zech. 4.9 και επιγνωση διوتي Κυριος παντοκρατωρ εξαπεσταλκε με προς σε.

6.15 και γνωσεσθε διوتي Κυριος παντοκρατωρ απεσταλκε με προς υμας.

8.6 ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Διوتي ει αδυνατησει. . .

11.11 και γνωσονται οι Χαναναιοι τα προβατα τα φυλασσομενα, διوتي λογος Κυριου εστι.

<sup>44</sup>Verhoef's assessment of the argument of the Hebrew is very good. He states, "The subject of both parallel clauses is 'my covenant,' the content being, on the one hand, 'life and peace,' and on the other hand, *mora'*, 'fear,' 'reverence.' God's blessing to Levi consists of 'life and peace.' These he gave him. Levi's obligation was to comply with the *mora'* aspect of the covenant." (p. 246) It would certainly be wrong to imagine that there was any theological motive behind the Greek translation at this point. The differences appear to be the result of the translator's mistaken view of the Hebrew syntax. Yet, it must be stated that the results of the rather mistaken reading of the translator are absolutely brimming with theological possibilities. The construction of *διδωμι* + infinitive with the meaning "to grant to do something" is so common in Hellenistic Greek, that one should view any suggestions of an elided "commandment" with great suspicion. See esp. BAGD p. 193 \*1β, Thayer p. 146 \*III and Blass/Debrunner §392 1 *ε*.

<sup>45</sup>TDNT Vol.7, p. 589.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. esp. MM who say:

(2) Hence "bring together," "make compact," as of setting or shortening the sails of a ship (Hom. *Il.* i. 433, *Od.* iii. 11), from which it is a natural transition to the more general meaning "restrain," "check," and in the mid. "draw or shrink back from" anything, whether from fear (Hesych.: *στελλεται* φοβείται) or any other motive, as in Malachi <sup>25</sup> *απο προσωπου ονοματος μου στελλεσθαι αυτον*, 3 Macc 11 <sup>19</sup> *αι δε και προσαρτιως εσταλμεναι* ("die sich ganz zurückgezogen halten," Kautsch): cf. Hipp. *Vet. med.* 10 (ed. Foësius) *οὐτ' ἀν ἀποσχοιντο ὧν ἐπιθυμεουσιν, οὐτε στείλαιντο*, and the old gloss quoted in Steph. *Thesaur. s.v.* where *στελλεσθαι* is explained by *ἀφίστασθαι ἀναχωρεῖν*. (p. 587)

<sup>47</sup>Kaminka has suggested that the translation of the MP reflects the mixed experience of the Jews of the Diaspora. He states:

Daß die Juden damals in der Diaspora eine hervorragende Stellung einnahmen, möchte man aus der Deutung von Am 6<sub>1</sub> ἀποτρύγησαν ἀρχας ἐθνῶν schließen; daß sie aber auch Schmähungen zu erdulden hatten, aus der Formulierung der Übersetzung Mal 2<sub>9</sub> von der Verachtung εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (st. לְכָל הָעַם), auf die Stellung Israels unter den Völkern bezogen! (p. 45)

However, the precise meaning of the translation of Am. 6.1 is far from clear. Just what would it mean to gather as a cluster of grapes the rulers of the nations? And the translation might represent a simple misreading. For clearly, שְׁמֵרוֹנֵי קְצִירֵהוּא שִׁיתֵּהֶם might be read as שְׁמֵרוֹנֵי קְצִירֵהוּא שִׁיתֵּהֶם. For τρυγᾶω in the MP always represents a rendering of some form of קָצַר. This is the only occurrence of ἀποτρύγᾶω. Furthermore, the rendering of ἐθνῶν for הָעַם is expected. However, the rendering of εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη for the Hebrew לְכָל הָעַם is very interesting. In every other instance in the MP, where ἔθνος renders עַם, the Hebrew form is plural (Jl. 2.17, Zech. 12.3--And the only comparable constructions (with כָּל) are rendered with λαός: Hag. 2.4 כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ = πᾶς ὁ λαός τῆς γῆς, Zech. 7.5 כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ = πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς. It does appear that the translator has allowed his perceptions of the experience of the Hellenistic Diaspora to influence his treatment of the Biblical text.

<sup>48</sup>It is not impossible that the translator read the נִבְגַּל of the previous line as the Niphal, noted that this line expects a masculine verb rather than the feminine and then concluded that the verbs had been wrongly interchanged and that in the process בִּגַּל had acquired an extra ה. This suggestion gains a little support from the definite rearrangement of 10a. The translator did imagine some displacement in his *Vorlage*.

<sup>49</sup>Dingermann, p. 232.

<sup>50</sup>Martin, Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period Vol. 1. Trans. by John Bowden (1974) First one-volume ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 155-6.

<sup>51</sup>On the general state of relations between Jews and Gentiles in the Diaspora see the very good discussion in Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135) Vol. 3.1 Revised ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and M. Goodman (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1986), pp. 150–176. A pertinent reference to the problem of the intermarriage of the Levites with Gentile women is found in the Testament of Levi (14: 5–7): "You plunder the Lord's offerings; from his share you steal choice parts, contemptuously eating them with whores. You teach the Lord's commands out of greed for gain; married women you profane; you have intercourse with whores and adulteresses. You take gentile women for your wives and your sexual relations will become like Sodom and Gomorrah." [James H. Charlesworth, ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1983), p. 793.] Earlier in the same testament Isaac warned Levi, "Be on guard against the spirit of promiscuity, for it is constantly active and through your descendants it is about to defile the sanctuary. Therefore take for yourself a wife while you are still young, a wife who is free of blame or profanation, who is not from the race of alien nations." (9: 9–10) This type of rigoristic language, which is not uncommon in the literature of 2nd Temple Judaism, only betrays the extent of such intermarriage. [Cf. Jubilees 30.7, 11 (Notice the place of Levi in the chapter!), Pseudo-Philo 9.5 (Amran of the tribe of Levi argues that Tamar's incest was preferable to relations with a Gentile.), 21.1 Moses' prediction that the people would soon commit idolatry (Deut. 31.16) is concretely interpreted to refer to their "intermingling with those inhabiting the land," 30.1, 43.5, 45.3 (the Levite's concubine had apparently had sexual relations with the Amalekites.), Joseph and Aseneth (This interesting romance couples a rigoristic view of intermarriage (Ch. 7.5–6) with the ultimate marriage of Joseph and the Egyptian Aseneth. The tension between these two is resolved in the dramatic conversion of the woman.)]

<sup>52</sup>Wellhausen ingeniously suggested that the Hebrew should be written as עֵד וְעֹנֶה. He stated, "וענה (so zu lesen) עד bezeichnet wohl,

wie sonst קראוּ וְעֹנֶה, die beiden Parteien vor Gericht; עד is der Kläger (3,5) und הַעֵיד בִּי heisst anklagen." (p. 198) This suggestion is adopted by many of the older commentators and recently by BHS. However, as noted by Glazier-McDonald, "In the first place the definite technical meaning he claims for עֵד וְעֹנֶה, "Kläger" and "Vertheidiger," cannot be deduced from

(femina) reus/quis" (p. 726) The Vulgate reads, "cum omni habitante dimittit." This reading reflects a Hebrew text virtually identical to the

actual Hebrew usage. עֵד is a witness; whether for or against is always

determined by the context. The verb עָנָה, as a legal term is also used both ways, and more frequently for accusing than for defending. Moreover, according to Torrey, it does not appear that the prophet is speaking of a legal tribunal. 'The 'ed and 'oneh are to be cut off, not from the judgment seat, but 'from dwellings of Jacob'." (p. 94)

<sup>53</sup>Commentators on the Hebrew are divided on the logical force of מֵאֵין. The Hebrew can quite naturally suggest either cause or result. If the resultative force is most natural, then we are either dealing with a bold metonymy where the weeping is representative of the cause of that weeping (treachery of the husbands?) or with some sort of pagan fertility rite. For an eloquent defense of the view that the text refers to "to syncretistic phenomena that have entered the Yahweh cult via intermarriage" see especially Glazier-McDonald (pp. 98-99). But if the cause of Yahweh's disregard of their offerings has been clearly and specifically explained in terms of their syncretistic practices it is somewhat difficult to understand the question in 14a עַל־מָה. The interrogative force of the Greek of verse 13 completely alters the logical force of the passage.

<sup>54</sup>S. Schreiner, "Mischehen-Ehebruch-Ehehscheidung: Betrachtungen zu Malachi 2: 10-16" ZAW 91 (1979), 207-28. Rudolph vigorously objects to Schreiner's treatment of the passage in his rejoinder "Zu Malachi 2: 10-16" ZAW (1981) 85-90. He regards שָׁנֵא as a verbal adjective with the force of a participle and שָׁלַח as an infinitive used as a substantive. He suspects that אֲנִי fell out of the text because of the preceding שָׁנֵא. But Glazier-McDonald's estimate of Rudolph's treatment is sound: "Such an interpretation may be objected on the grounds that making Yahweh the subject is wholly arbitrary and requires too many inferences." (p. 110)

<sup>55</sup>Baldwin p. 241. And compare van Hoonacker's assessment of the significance of the MT's pointing. He states, "שָׁנֵא a été compris 1° comme participe pour le verbe à la seconde personne (LXX); כִּי שָׁנֵא serait l'énoncé d'une condition, auquel שָׁלַח serait suite comme impératif: Si tu hais (la femme), renvoielà!" (p. 728) The Vulgate reads, "cum odio habueris dimmitte." This reading reflects a Hebrew text virtually identical to the

MT. It is difficult to imagine what might have motivated Jerome to write such a thing unless he felt compelled to follow the text and tradition of vocalisation he had inherited! On the targums' "But if you hate her, divorce her" see Cathcart and Gordon p.235 f.n. 29. They regard this as a "straightforward example of Targumic 'converse translation'." However, it is difficult to imagine how their suggested meaning for the MT, "he hates divorce" is conceivable in view of the following **אמר יהוה אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** If the clause is put into the mouth of Yahweh, it really needs to be in the first person. As J. M. P. Smith says, "The first two words of this verse as found in **M** are unintelligible in this context. **M** can only be rendered, 'He hates putting away.' But 'he' must refer to Yahweh who is himself the speaker." (p. 56) And it is, of course, difficult to understand how this can be a straightforward case of converse translation when the translation has every appearance of being an exact, literal rendering of the MT. G. F. Moore describes some of the rabbinical views concerning the meaning of the verse:

Malachi 2,16 was taken by R. Johanan to mean, Hateful (to God) is the man who puts away his wife (cf. vs. 14); but the same words are interpreted by R. Judah, If you hate her, put her away. R. Hanina (ben Papa) deduced from the same passage ('the God of Israel,' vs. 16) that only in Israel has divorce a religious sanction. R. Eleazar, from vss. 14 and 16, that the very altar drops tears on every one who divorces his first wife ('the wife of his youth,' vs. 14)." [Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim, Vol, 2 (Cambridge, 1927-1930; reprint New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 123.]

Cashdan, in his comments on this verse, notes that the Talmud is quoted by Rashi thus: "If thou hatest her, then put her away; but act not cruelly by retaining her in the home, if thou art estranged from her." [A. Cohen, ed., The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary (London: The Soncino Press, 1957), p. 348.]

<sup>56</sup>Although virtually all commentators on the Hebrew feel compelled to rewrite the text to some extent, the MT can be regarded as possible and intelligible, albeit very difficult. If one is hesitant to abandon the pointing of the perfect and regard **וַיִּסְתֵּר** as the infinitive, then it is best to follow GKC §155 *n* and to understand the clause as an independent relative clause. It is then possible to regard the whole of vs. 16 (contra GKC) as stating the following: "If he hates *her*, send *her* away, says the Lord God of Israel, even he *who* covers his garment with violence, says the Lord God Almighty. But take heed to your spirit and do not deal treacherously." This reading would mean that Yahweh commands the treacherous husband who is presently covering his wife or his own



person with the violence of his hatred and abuse to do that which is commanded in Deuteronomy 24--namely, to divorce formally and legally his wife and give her freedom from her hateful spouse.

<sup>57</sup>The frequency with which the view that the Hebrew forbids divorce while the Greek commissions it is repeated is baffling. In fact the opposite is true. Typical is the statement of Perowne who says, "The rendering of A. V. margin, which is also that of the LXX. and Targum, 'if he hate her, put her away,' makes the prophet call upon those whom he is rebuking to avail themselves of the provision of the Law, as the least of two evils..." (p. 27)

<sup>58</sup>Vollers, pp. 75-6.

<sup>59</sup>This is very close to what J. M. P. Smith thinks the Hebrew text should be regarded as saying. He translates, "For one who hates and sends away covers his clothing with violence, says Yahweh of hosts." (p. 55) However, he obtains this smooth reading only by altering the pointing from שָׁלַח to שָׁלַח.

<sup>60</sup>So Vollers, p. 76.

<sup>61</sup>Dingermann, p. 233.

<sup>62</sup>The renderings of פָּנָה (Qal) in the MP are consistent in using επιβλεπω: Hos. 3.1, Hag. 1.9, Mal. 2.13. The Hosea passage would have been better served with επιστρέφω. The noun פָּנָה is elsewhere in the MP rendered: Zeph. 1.16 τας γωνιας (הַפְּנוֹת), 3.6 γωνιαι αυτων (פְּנוֹתָם), Zech. 14.10 εως της πυλης των γωνιων (עַד־שַׁעַר הַפְּנִים).

<sup>63</sup>Dingermann has a helpful discussion of this verse on p. 234. However, it must be questioned whether the additions are, as he suggests, the product of a "Bearbeiter." He offers no argument in support of the suggestion. There is no reason to doubt that the verse is a unified, albeit expansive, product of the translator himself.

<sup>64</sup>J. M. P. Smith (p. 68) offers a thorough, although overly-sympathetic, survey of the various proposed emendations. His statement about Mi. 2.2 is very confused. He states, "שָׁלַח cannot well be the object of עָשָׂה, for this verb everywhere else has a personal object. Mi. 2<sup>2</sup> is no true exception to this usage, for the real objects of עָשָׂה there

are גבר and אִישׁ, בית and נחלתו being of secondary importance and attached to 'ל' by zeugma." But surely a zeugmatic construction with the verb in question must be a relevant analogy to a similar zeugmatic construction with the same verb elsewhere!

<sup>65</sup>Von Bulmerincq rightly notes that "הַמָּה" ist hier wie Jes. 29,21. Amos 5,12 mit dem Akkus. der Person konstruiert, doch mit Recht erklären schon Kimhi und I.-Ezra מַטִּי-הָרַם als elliptische Ausdrucksweise für "מִשְׁפַּט גֵּר מַטִּי" (Vol. II, p. 386)

<sup>66</sup>See esp. Verhoef p. 294.

<sup>67</sup>Cf. J. M. P. Smith p. 68.

<sup>68</sup>The Vulgate has a similar predicate construction with "ego enim Dominus et non mutor et vos filii Iacob non estis consumpti."

<sup>69</sup>A plausible alternative explanation is that the translator of Job had no knowledge of the word מֶזֶם, assimilated in 11.15 toward the כַּמִּים of verse 16, he arbitrarily guessed at the meaning in 31.7 and thus 36.18 demonstrates no association of ideas in his mind. The Hebrew word only occurs in 11.15 and 31.7 so we cannot be absolutely sure he knew the word.

<sup>70</sup>Dingermann, p. 234.

<sup>71</sup>So Verhoef p. 303.

<sup>72</sup>It would certainly be possible to imagine an original הַעֲמִים כָּלֹ which was corrupted to כָּלֹ הַיָּמִים (behind εως συνετελεσθη) and also revised to הַגֹּיִם כָּלֹ/כָלָה. Cf. J. M. P. Smith's mention of Schulte's emendation (p. 75). However, this reconstruction is probably overly complicated and thus unlikely. And the ל' would not easily be misread as the י'. It is curious that Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion share the reading of the LXX.

<sup>73</sup>This is perhaps the implication of Dingermann's statement: "מַרְףִּי hat der Übersetzer als Beute, Raub (διδραπαγή) genommen. Im MT ist an 'Nahrung' gedacht, wie das Wort auch Ps. 111,5 ; Prov. 31, 15 und Job 24,5 gebraucht ist." (p. 235) Cf. Stekhoven, "Hij kende מַרְףִּי niet als 'spijze' Ma 3<sup>10</sup>." (p. 103) This would certainly be an adequate explanation if this



strange rendering were in isolation and if it were the expected rendering of the majority meaning of מִטְרִי. But it is hardly adequate in view of the massive rewriting of the whole section and in view of the absence of the expected θηρα.

<sup>74</sup>J. M. P. Smith, p. 72.

<sup>75</sup>Verhoef, p. 307.

<sup>76</sup>Verhoef, p. 308.

<sup>77</sup>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, Vol. 2 (p. 69) states, "In the LXX, *bhn* is translated by *dokimazein*, 'to put to the test, examine' (12 times), *etazein*, 'to examine' (3 times), *exetazein*, 'to examine' (twice), *krinein*, 'to judge,' *diakrinein*, 'to separate, judge correctly, give a decision,' etc."

<sup>78</sup>It must be admitted that there are numerous instances of man "tempting or testing" Yahweh in the Greek OT. However, this idea is not found in the Greek MP. The principal synonyms of בָּחַן are:

חָקַח (never has God as the object)

נִסָּה Key passages which speak of man testing God include: Ex. 17: 2(πειραζω), 7(πειραζω); Nu. 14: 22(πειραζω); Dt. 6: 16(εκπειραζω); 33: 8(πειραζω); Ps. 78: 18(εκπειραζω), 41(πειραζω), 56(πειραζω); 95: 9(πειραζω); 106: 14(πειραζω); Is. 7: 12(πειραζω)

צָרָה never has God as the object. Where the Pass. Part. is used in reference to the word of God (2 Sa 22:31; Ps. 18:30; 119:140; Prov. 30:5) the meaning is simply "pure."

<sup>79</sup>LS (p. 909) list the meaning "sluice" as found in Heliodorus 9.8. This is probably just another case of metonymy. It is peculiar that the cognate verb καταρραω is used to translate the Hiphil verb אָרַב in I Sam. 2.33 אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ וְלֹא־אֵרַב = και καταρραειν την ψυχην αυτου. Did the translator imagine a corruption from or simply misread an original אָרַב (hyp. root אָרַב--"to flow")? The occurrences of אָרַב are:

Gen. 7.11 οι καταρρακται του ουρανου ηγεωχθησαν

Gen. 8.2 οι καταρρακται του ουρανου

2 Ki. 7.2 καταρρακτας εν ουρανω

Koh. 12.3 ταις οπαις ("a hole of opening")

Isa. 24.18 θυρίδες εκ του ουρανου

Isa. 60.8 ως περιστεραι συν νεοσσοις ("with chicks"--free conjecture?)

Hos. 13.3 ως ατμεις απο ακριδων (vocalized as **חַבִּירִים**--"locust")

וְיָ:

<sup>80</sup>See MM p. 154, particularly the mention of P Lond 45<sup>29</sup> οπως ανακαλεσαμενος τους προειρημενους διαστείλη ταυτοις μηκετι εισβιαζεσθαι εις κτλ. Dingermann imagines that the clause means "und ich teile." (p. 235) He then speculates that because the root **על** was unknown to the translator he read **על** as **צל** which is a variant spelling of **קל** ("to cut"). However, the suggestion suffers from a narrow and unlikely view of διαστελλω, a Hebrew/Greek (**קל** /διαστελλω) correlation which is without parallel and an unattested variant spelling of **צל** for **קל**.

<sup>81</sup>So Dingermann who states, "Durch diese abw. Lesung ist er gezwungen, statt der 3.Person (**וְלֹא יִשְׁחַת**) mit der 1.Person (ου μη διφθειρω) zu übersetzen." (p. 235)

<sup>82</sup>Verhoef, p. 309.

<sup>83</sup>Cf. Job 35.16 εν αγνωσια ρηματα βαρυνει. Concerning the second person of the Greek, Dingermann states, "Die Übersetzung geht nicht auf eine andere Lesung zurück, sondern ist durch das folgende **אָמַרְתָּ** (και ειπατε) veranlaßt worden." (p. 236)

<sup>84</sup>Vollers, p. 78.

<sup>85</sup>As Verheof states, "The 'arrogant' therefore were either the covenant people as such, or else those members of the nation who had already inwardly and publicly broken with the faith of the fathers, the agnostics, and the skeptics." (p. 318) Similarly, Deutsch states, "Verses 14 and 15 may thus well reflect actual social and religious conditions, and conflicts between rival viewpoints in that postexilic Jewish community to which Malachi also belonged." [Graham S. Ogden and Richard R. Deutsch, A Promise of Hope--A Call to Obedience: A Commentary on the Books of Joel and Malachi, International Theological Commentary, ed. Fredrick Carlson Holmgren and George A. F. Knight (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1987), p. 108.]

<sup>86</sup>It is possible to prefer the text of the MT while retaining the

essential logic of the LXX by assigning a conjunctive force to וְ. As Ralph Smith notes:

Rudolph says that וְ must not be taken as an adverb here, but as a conjunction. He translates the sentence, "But since the God-fearers (so) spoke to one another Yahweh listened attentively." This interpretation implies that the God-fearers had been speaking in doubt and skepticism. Joyce Baldwin says that 'those who feared Yahweh are not necessarily a different group from those who had been complaining, but they are those who have taken the rebuke, and they begin to encourage each other to renewed faith' (Baldwin 249). (p. 338)

Furthermore, The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text surprises readers with the following translation: "In this vein have those who revere the LORD been talking to one another." So it would not be quite fair to suggest that the Hebrew of the MT is unambiguous. Nevertheless, it is quite fair to say that the normal function of וְ is temporal, and if the temporal function be admitted then the Hebrew does indeed suggest a disjunction, perhaps even an "antithesis" between the speakers of vv. 14 & 15 and the speakers of v. 16. So Ralph Smith concludes, "But it is better to take וְ as an adverb 'then,' and make the God-fearers a separate group from the skeptics who spoke in vv 14-15." (p. 338)

<sup>87</sup>Gelston states, "Mt iii 16 is explicable only as the result of the influence of LXX ταυτα, which itself may have arisen as a corruption of τοτε cf. Rudolph)" (p. 162) It is a curiosity that while a number of scholars decry the LXX and Peshitta on the grounds of their absurdity and impossibility, others read the Hebrew with the same essential logic as those versions while retaining the וְ of the MT. This well illustrates the difficulties inherent in the concept of *lectio difficilior*.

<sup>88</sup>J.M.P. Smith, p. 78. Cathcart and Gordon argue against Smith and insist that in fact the Targums follow the MT. (p. 238)

<sup>89</sup>One can with some justification refer to the "superficiality" of the smoothness of the MT because the text is totally uninformative about such crucial matters as who, where and when. The switch from the first person of vv. 14 & 15 to the third person of v. 16a without any clarification about who it is that is being spoken of is simply incomprehensible.

<sup>90</sup>Gelston, p. 151. The Peshitta agrees with the LXX in treating the verb as *an active*.

<sup>91</sup>Vollers p. 78 and Dingermann p. 236

<sup>92</sup>Glazier-McDonald draws attention to the treatment of Halévy. She states, "Halévy circumvents the distance problem by connecting סגלה with עשה and translating 'le jour ou je constituerai un trésor de choix.'" [J. Halévy, "Le prophete Malachie," RS 17 (1909) 42] (p. 225). She rejects this treatment of the syntax. I suspect most commentators would translate סגלה ליום אשר אני עשה the way Halévy and the LXX do were it not for the fact that elsewhere סגלה is typically used to refer to Yahweh's people. But this is not decisive. Perowne (p. 35) points out that the accentuation of the MT supports the translation of the LXX (also the reading of Dr. Scrivener "in that day when I make up my jewels" and the R. V. margin, "wherein I do make a peculiar treasure"). The conjunctive *munah* accent under the word עשה would scarcely permit one to disconnect the following noun from its accentually linked participle. (Cf. C. F. Keil p. 467.)

<sup>93</sup>Inasmuch as texts from Qumran (1QpHab) have instead ופרשו פרשו, it is possible that the LXX reflects instead the *Varlage* פרשו. But this is unlikely inasmuch as even the divergent text from Qumran represents פוש and the reading probably represents nothing but a text corrupted by dittography which is not in any way related to the reading of the LXX. It is unlikely that in view of the next phrase that ופרשו פרשו would have been translated as the Greek of the verse. For the context explicitly suggests the flight of a bird, thus ופרשו would definitely mean "they spread out their wings." Some scholars emend Hab. 1 on the grounds of the unsuitability of the root פוש. But the unsuitability of that root is known primarily from the judgment that somehow the LXX demonstrates that the root means "to paw playfully." It is much simpler to imagine that the LXX translators did not know the meaning of the root and that in fact there is nothing whatsoever playful about the pawing of פוש. One might even speculate that there was a proverbial basis for the idea. The intense irony of a previously confined heifer being allowed access to a field and then in its impetuosity doing serious damage to that field is the stuff of which proverbs are made!

<sup>94</sup>In that classic description of the warhorse in Job 39.19-25 it is

said he paws in the valley (יִחְפְּרוּ בַעֲמֻק) vs. 21, verb elsewhere used of digging a well) and he swallows up the ground (יִגְמַא-אֶרֶץ) Surely one must imagine that the poor foot-soldier is being threshed by this awesome creature.

<sup>95</sup>Dr. S. M. Lehman states, "The word *marbek* is derived from an Arabic root meaning 'to tie up,' and its use as *stall* comes from the practice of shutting up calves in a stall to be fattened." [in the Soncino edition of the Twelve Prophets, ed. by A. Cohen--on Amos 6.4 (p. 108).]

<sup>96</sup>The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol. 3, p. 147.

<sup>97</sup>Glazier-McDonald pp. 268-9. Her suggestion that the Hebrew of Ben Sirah reflects with its הָשִׁיב and הָכִין a cognizance of the LXX's ἀποκαταστήσαι represents a serious challenge to the view that the הָשִׁיב/ἐπιστρέψαι of 10c "may suggest that the grandson knew a variant form of the Malachi passage." (So Benjamin G. Wright, No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text, Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 26. Claude E. Cox, ed. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 210-211. See also his note \*183 on p. 303 concerning the citation of Mal. 3.23 in Luke 1.17.) For if Ben Sirah consciously derived both verbal ideas from his knowledge of both the Greek and Hebrew of Mal. 3.24, then it is fairly likely that his grandson chose the הָשִׁיב/ἐπιστρέψαι rendering only because the καταστήσαι needed to be reserved for the following הָכִין.

<sup>98</sup>Glazier-McDonald, p. 258.

<sup>99</sup>Giesen, in his discussion of חָרֵם (root 2) states, "In Mic. 7:2 *herem* is either deleted or emended to *harim*, 'nobles,' or *herimū*, 'lift the hands to do evil,' and linked to v. 3. in light of Aquila, Symmachus, the Syriac, the Targum, and CD 16:15, which also read *herem*--albeit with the meaning 'ban'--the MT should be retained." TDOT Vol. 5, p. 201. In the same volume on חָרֵם (root 1), Lohfink states, "In Mic. 7:2, the LXX, Vulg., Targum, Syriac, Aquila, and Symmachus find a further occurrence of *herem* I; but the metaphor of hunting and pursuit in v. 2b supports *herem* II. Only the LXX is consistent, presupposing a totally legal text by reading *yryby* for *y'rby* and *yryby* for *yryby*. But this Hebrew original for the LXX is probably secondary with respect to the MT (assimilation to v. 3)." (p. 182)



## CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSION

In Chapter 2 we examined the evidence which might have suggested the existence of a proto-septuagintal text-type in the early Hebrew tradition of the Minor Prophets. We found that agreements between variant Hebrew texts and the LXX were quite rare and that such agreements usually represented instances of non-genealogical agreement based on mundane matters of style. We concluded with Vegas-Montaner that with respect to the Minor Prophets the ancient textual situation looked like a "gran fluctuación textual, con frecuentes intercambios entre los textos." This conclusion then served as a cautionary consideration in the textual commentary of Haggai and Malachi. In light of the absence of any substantial evidence that differences between the LXX and MT corresponded in a systematic way with any putative Hebrew text-type, we were quite careful to consider other possible explanations of such differences before resorting to the differing *Vorlage* hypothesis. Frequently we found reason to suspect that the translator's sense of style or his perceptions of the significance of the passage were behind the differences between the LXX and MT. To put it baldly, the LXX of Haggai and Malachi reflects a very high degree of stylistic and hermeneutical intentionality. Furthermore, we have argued that in most instances where earlier scholars have posited a Hebrew *Vorlage* which was different from the MT, the suggested texts were unlikely in terms of Hebrew idiom and very often the divergent Greek could be explained with reference to analogous differences found elsewhere in the LXX of the Minor Prophets.

And yet, we are not really arguing against the literalism of the

translation. We noted numerous instances of extreme, almost wooden literalism in the text. And we are, of course, aware that virtually all previous studies of the LXX of the Minor Prophets have agreed that the translation is quite literal. So, for example, in 1962, Joseph Ziegler concluded that "Die Dodekapropheten--LXX bietet eine gute, ziemlich wörtliche Übersetzung (im Gegensatz zur freien Isaias--LXX) ihrer hebr. Vorlage."<sup>1</sup> But, in recent years it has become increasingly clear that assessments of the literalism of a translation must be more carefully formulated than they used to be for there are different types and different measures of literalness. Indeed this is the precise point of Barr's important work, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations.<sup>2</sup> It is no longer adequate to position books of the LXX on a continuum of literalism or freedom. One must specify what aspects of literalism are being assessed. And when the question is approached in this way, it becomes clear that many texts are both highly literal by certain measures and yet quite free by others. So for example, in the very important article, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX" by E. Tov and B. G. Wright, the Minor Prophets were judged to be difficult to plot on a literal/free continuum. The authors conclude their interesting study with the following statement:

The preceding statistical information presents a picture of diversity of translation. On the basis of this information, the books can be divided into the categories of "literal", "relatively literal", "free" and "relatively free". Some books, however, are difficult to characterize because of the range of variation from one criterion to another, at least at this initial stage of the investigation. A good example are the Minor Prophets (MP) (taken both as individual books and as one translation unit). In the case of the rendering of כִּי and the third person singular masculine suffix, MP is very consistent and



represents a relatively literal translation technique, but a relative amount of freedom is shown in the treatment of ׀ and the addition of prepositions. A relatively large number of post-position particles appear in MP as well.<sup>3</sup>

Tov and Wright have suggested that the LXX of the Minor Prophets defies categorization on a unitary continuum of literalness. This is certainly true. But what is much more significant about the translation of these books is that the translation can reflect a very high degree of literalness while at the same time reflecting an extremely high degree of intentionality at the level of the hermeneutical decisions of the ancient translator. It could be said that the LXX of the MP is very literal and yet does not consistently partake of the passive or slavish dependence on the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the Greek which is typically related to a high degree of literalism. In other words, there seems to be decisive proof in the LXX of the MP that there is no necessary connection between literalism and the degree of hermeneutical freedom exercised by the translator. This conclusion has several substantial implications.

First, it raises serious questions about the usefulness of various essentially mechanical measures of literalism in determining the probability that the translator of a given book of the Old Testament intentionally departed from his *Vorlage* in a particular instance. If there is substantial evidence that the translator did in fact on occasion depart from his *Vorlage* on hermeneutical grounds, then it is quite impossible to obtain much help in evaluating a specific difference between the LXX and the MT by employing generalizations derived from statistical analyses of various mechanical aspects of translation technique. If intentional hermeneutically-motivated differences are ever observed in a translation, then it becomes necessary to consider all of the differences in terms of what the translator might have had in mind if he

3xvi. We further believe that not only the approach being advocated

were responsible for a given difference. And there is no adequate way to approach that question except by detailed and comprehensive examinations of all of the analogous words or constructions in the translation. Furthermore, it is necessary that the change be viewed closely in its immediate context to see if that alteration is a part of a more sweeping rewriting of the passage. Few septuagintal studies have followed through with comprehensive assessments of relevant analogous passages within the same text. And yet the translator's method and thought are only perceived through more or less unambiguous clusters or patterns of like alterations which reflect the translator's interests. And few septuagintal studies have examined closely the possibility that individual differences in a given passage might coalesce into a thematically coherent rewriting. Most studies of the past approached the differences between the LXX and MT strictly atomistically. But there is no chance of confronting the mind of the translator in an atomistic approach. Takamitsu Muraoka, in the introductory discussion of his very important article "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," states concerning this problem:

Such an attitude towards OT textual criticism, the latter-day version of *hebraica veritas*, seems to affect some scholars whose primary interest is in the Septuagint itself. Apart from writers who are concerned with textcritical, grammatical or lexical studies of the Greek version, the approach taken by most Septuagint scholars seems to me to be generally atomistic, concerned with single words or phrases or part of them. The question is only rarely raised as to how the translator possibly understood his Hebrew *Vorlage*, not merely single words or phrases, but the whole sentence, let alone the whole paragraph, chapter or book concerned. Nor does one ask often how the translation that has resulted can be understood *as Greek* without regard to the Hebrew. . . . It is our firm belief that full justice cannot be done to this important ancient version unless he supplements the traditional atomistic approach by studying it as an independent work in its own right, of course with constant reference to the original text. We further believe that not only the approach being advocated

here supplements the traditional one, but the latter alone could distort the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text.<sup>4</sup>

But perhaps the most significant implication of our conclusion that the LXX of the MP (more particularly Haggai and Malachi) reflects frequent and substantial departures from the translator's *Vorlage* on the grounds of his particular theological and literary concerns pertains to our estimate of the essential nature of the translation. When a translation does not betray such a hermeneutical character it is quite possible to view it as simply a more or less defective witness to be used in the reconstruction of the translation's *Vorlage*. However, we have demonstrated that the LXX of Haggai and Malachi is a literary/theological work in its own right. We have illustrated repeatedly in the textual commentary that a close reading of the text brings us face to face with the very interesting thought of the translator himself. As Claude Cox, in "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job" states,

The case for the legitimacy of doing exegesis in the LXX, whether it be LXX Job, LXX Genesis, or the LXX translation of any other book, rests upon the correctness of the assertion that the LXX is a literary achievement in its own right. After all, except for the so-called Apocrypha, the LXX is literature in translation, and exegesis of literature in translation whose parent text is extant surely requires some defense. That defense must be that the LXX, as a collection of documents of Hellenistic Judaism, has had a life of its own, apart from its parent Hebrew text and, as such, gives us access to another world of literary, theological, sociological, and historical insights.<sup>5</sup>

It is a curious irony in the history of Septuagint scholarship that oftentimes those scholars who explained the differences between the LXX and the MT in terms of translation technique imagined that this explanation served as some sort of vindication of the MT against the rival claims of a usurper--the *Vorlage* of the LXX.<sup>6</sup> But in fact, to the extent that the translation is not merely a more or less defective transmission

of its *Vorlage*, but actually a literary and theological creation itself, then an enlarged view of the freedom of the translator only accentuates the independent integrity of the septuagintal books. Although it is outside the scope of this work to explore the theological implications of the authorial integrity of the LXX, it is obvious that viewing the LXX as having its own literary and theological integrity raises interesting questions both theological and historical concerning the place of the LXX as one of several authoritative scriptures among the believing communities which treasure(d) them as such.<sup>7</sup>

Whereas the myriad of intentional alterations based apparently on stylistic considerations alone are of some interest and certainly must be understood if one wishes to be able to assess the probability of various suggestions made concerning a differing *Vorlage*, these modifications are common to virtually all ancient translation and are thus not particularly noteworthy.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, J. Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven brilliantly discussed such stylistic matters in his excellent work over one hundred years ago. There is no need to rehearse his conclusions or to restate what we have already mentioned in the textual commentary. But inasmuch as few of the past studies of the LXX of the Minor Prophets have treated adequately the issue of the hermeneutical principles behind the oftentimes provocative alterations of meaning observed in the text, it is certainly in order to highlight a few of those principles. We have seen in our treatment of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi that the translator re-shaped the biblical text before him in light of certain interests. These interests include:

#### 1. Eschatological concerns.

There are several evidences that the translator allowed his particular eschatological interests to influence substantially his translation. First,

there is a rather clear intensification of eschatological language in a few passages. Such an intensification seems the most likely explanation of the interesting rendering יהודה תחת as εκ φυλης Ιουδα (Hag. 1.1, 14; 2.1,21; Cf. the Greek plus in Hag. 1.12). An interest in the messianic significance of Zerubbabel's relation to the tribe of Judah seems much more likely than a hesitance to refer to him as the "governor of Judah." And this type of typological expansion of Zerubbabel's significance is perhaps continued in the remarkable legend about the contest between the bodyguards of Darius which Zerubbabel wins with his speech about the superior strength of truth in I Esdras 3-4. Furthermore, both Zerubbabel and Joshua attain to a very high place of honor in Sirach 49.11-12, "How shall we magnify Zerubbabel? He was like a signet on the right hand, and so was Jeshua the son of Jozadak; in their days they built the house and raised a temple (some texts read people--ναον/λαον ) holy to the Lord prepared for everlasting glory." And there can be no doubt that Joshua is the object of a typological idealization in the LXX of Jer. 23.5-6. For in this explicitly messianic passage the Greek text identifies the Branch not with the Hebrew as צדקנו יהוה "Yahweh Our Righteousness"--a word-play on the King's name, Zedekiah, but as Κυριος Ιωσεδεκ "Lord Josedek." This is no simple confused double reading. A comparison with the other Branch passages (Zech. 3.8 and Zech. 6.12) removes all doubt that the translator of Jeremiah is identifying the Branch in terms of the priestly line of Joshua's father Josedek. A similar intensification of language which might have eschatological significance is found in Malachi 1.10. There the Hebrew מי גם-בכם ויסגר דלתים means "O that someone among you would close the doors." This is merely a hyperbolic statement of wish. The force of the clause in the Greek is very different and suggests a future judgment in which God forcibly closes the doors to the

temple. It might be argued that the translator has interjected a prophetic prediction into the text.

Not only does the LXX of Haggai and Malachi reflect an intensification of language which accentuates certain eschatological interests, it is also the case that the translation reflects a particular interest in the timing of such events. I have argued in the textual commentary that the Hebrew text of Haggai unambiguously links the time of eschatological fulfillment with the reign of Zerubbabel. The Greek, on the other hand, equally unambiguously severs that historical connection and projects the time of fulfillment deep into the reaches of the unknown future.<sup>9</sup> This is quite clearly the impact of the translator's alteration of the temporal orientation of Hag. 1.9 and 2.6. Similarly, whereas the Hebrew text of Malachi 3.10a concretely relates the time of fulfillment with the bringing in of the tithes, the Greek text severs that link by altering the mood of the verb (Hebrew imperative rendered with a Greek indicative) and by rendering tendentiously *הַמַּעֲשֹׂר* as *εκφορια* and *יָמָא* as *διαπραγη*. Furthermore, 3.10b-11 betray subtle reductions of the eschatological benefits promised in the Hebrew text. Thus the translator has reshaped both the explicit condition of verse 10a and the explicit resulting eschatological blessing of vv. 10b-11. It is also possible that the translator's view of the uncertainty of the timing of the great day of the Lord is suggested in the anarthrous *ἡμερα* as a rendering of *הַיּוֹם* in Mal. 4.1.

## 2. Historical perspective.

Although it should not be surprising, it is nevertheless interesting to notice that the translator on occasion allows issues or interests of his own day to filter into the ancient text. Evidently he made no sharp



distinction between Biblical history and his own history. Thus, for example, in Mal. 1.4 the Greek παρατετακται as a rendering of עָלַת is quite likely a deliberate, albeit subtle intensification of the language against Edom reflecting the advantage of historical perspective on Edom's downfall. There is nothing whatsoever subtle about the vilification of Edom which one confronts in the LXX of Obadiah 13 or in I Esdras 4.45. As discussed in the textual commentary, the Greek of Obadiah 13 implicates Edom in direct military complicity in the sacking of Jerusalem. And the passage in I Esdras 4 directly states that it was the Edomites who burned the temple in Jerusalem.

There is perhaps a direct reference to the Diaspora in Mal. 1.9. A careful consideration of the typical renderings in the MP suggests that the εις παντα τα εθνη for the Hebrew לְכָל הָעַם is tendentious. For as we pointed out in the textual commentary, in every other instance in the MP, where εθνος renders עַם, the Hebrew form is plural (Jl. 2.17, Zech. 12.3--And the only comparable constructions (with כָּל) are rendered with λαος: Hag. 2.4 כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ = πας ο λαος της γης, Zech. 7.5 כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ = παντα τον λαον της γης). The interests of the translator are also revealed in the unusual rendering of παρειμενους for the Hebrew וְשָׁפְלִים. Whereas the Hebrew would surely mean that the priests would be held in contempt by the people of Israel, the Greek would most naturally mean that the priests are neglected by Yahweh in their being scattered throughout the various Gentile nations. This general thought is understood and further intensified by the scribes responsible for the common corrections to various forms of ριπτω (παρα, απο) which stress the fact that Yahweh had cast them off into the various Gentile nations.



And while it is possible that εγκατελειφθη Ιουδας for בָּגַדְהָ יְהוּדָה in Mal. 2.11 simply represents a breakdown in thought, that is to say nonsense, it is also quite possible that this curious rendering suggests that in the conditions of the Diaspora in which the Jews were dispersed throughout the Gentile nations, this separation from the holy land constituted an abandonment by the people. What is far less uncertain is that the unexpected rendering και επετηδευσεν εις θεους αλλοτριους for וַבַּעַל כְּתֹאֵל נָכַר reflects the translator's interest to distinguish between the foreign women whom many of the Jewish men of the Diaspora had married and the attendant but not necessarily overwhelming religious and philosophical dangers which those marriages might imply. The translator changes the focus through his deletion of the idea of women in θεους αλλοτριους and his deletion of the idea of marriage in επετηδευσεν.

### 3. Metaphorical language.

The translator demonstrates a bold freedom in his rendering of metaphorical language in his *Varlage*. It is not particularly noteworthy that the translator altered metaphorical expressions which he found incomprehensible. So in Mal. 2.12 it is not surprising to find what must probably be regarded as the deletion of a curious figurative expression of totality from the text. The rendering εως και ταπεινωθη treats the Hebrew as though it were עַד וַיִּעַנֶּה. Whereas many of the other ancient versions guessed at the meaning of the curious expression in the MT, the translator of the Minor Prophets simply removed the expression from the text with a phonologically and orthographically simple rereading. Clearly all that is involved in the rereading is the vocalization and the reading of

לַעַד as לַעַד. However, there are instances where there is no decisive evidence that the translator did not understand the Hebrew language, rather it appears that he understood it and felt it could be improved. So, for example, in Mal. 3.12 one encounters the unique rendering of *καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀσθενήσῃ ὑμῖν ἡ ἀμπελος ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ* apparently representing the Hebrew *וְלֹא־תִשָּׁכַל לָכֶם הַגֶּפֶן בַּשָּׂדֶה*. Inasmuch as *ἀσθενέω* is the standard rendering of *כָּשַׁל*, it is very likely that the translator employed intentional metathesis and so treated the form as *תִּכָּשַׁל*. Because this is the only context in the Hebrew Bible which applies the verb *שָׁכַל* ("to miscarry") to inanimates, it is quite probable that the translator deemed the metaphorical expression clumsy and chose to rewrite it through metathesis.

In Mal. 4.2 (3.20) *σκιρτήσετε ὡς βοσχαρία ἐκ δεσμών ἀνείμενα* apparently renders the Hebrew *וַיִּפְשַׁתֶּם כַּעֲגֹלֵי מִרְבֵּק*. The connotation of the Greek verb is distinctly different from that of the Hebrew verb. The idea of skipping playfully is not part of the meaning of the Hebrew at all. Thus, while we cannot entirely rule out the translator's ignorance of the Hebrew verb *פִּיֵּשׁ*, nor can we absolutely dismiss the possibility of an unintentional confusion with the root *פִּיֵּשׁ*, nevertheless it remains quite likely that the translator boldly focussed the attention of the text on the exuberance of the recently released heifer while the Hebrew firmly fixes the focus on the wicked who are (as it were) under the feet of this heifer. The fundamental force of the simile is entirely altered by the choice of rendering of the verb.

In Mal. 3.10 one finds that *καὶ ἐκχέω ὑμῖν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου ὥς* *ἰκανῶθηναι* is apparently rendering *וְהִרִיקֹתִי לָכֶם בְּרֵכָה עַד־בְּלִי־יָדַי*. A similar situation is found in Mal. 3.10 where the translator seems to have preferred to

straightforward reading of the Hebrew would suggest that Yahweh is promising that He would give to the very limits of His resources. The translator of the Greek entirely alters the bold expression by rendering the text as though there were no negative בְּלִי. It seems very likely that the translator found the Hebrew expression excessively bold at a theological or philosophical level. Perhaps to his mind, what was lost in his translation in terms of rhetorical force was more than adequately compensated through what was gained by theological/philosophical precision. This change is closely related to a host of alterations which pertain to the translator's reverential concerns.

#### 4. Reverential concerns.

As was the case with metaphorical language, the sensibilities of the translator deeply influence his treatment of the text even in those instances where he is in less than full command of his *Vorlage*. So for example, in Mal. 3.9 it is very likely that the translator was not familiar with אָרַר in the Niphal, inasmuch as this is its only occurrence. Thus, suspecting that וְאֵתִי did double-duty between 9a and 9b, he wrongly imagined that the text implied an affront to the divine majesty. Through intentional metathesis and the deletion of the ך of נִאֲרִים, he created a new text which instead of the בְּמִאֲרָה אַתֶּם נִאֲרִים of his *Vorlage* (same as the MT) read בְּמִרְאָה אַתֶּם רִאִים = και αποβλεποντες υμεις αποβλεπετε.

The translator's modification of the text on reverential grounds can occur not only when the specifics of the Hebrew are in question but also when the translator has perhaps a mistaken view of the general sense of a passage. In Mal. 2.10, the translator imagining that the "one father" is either Abraham or Jacob, deemed it more reverent to show preference to

God the creator through the alteration of the order of the clauses.

In Mal. 3.10 and again in 3.15 one observes tendentious translations away from the clear suggestion of the Hebrew that a man is able to "test" (בִּחַן) Yahweh. In 3.10 one finds επισκεψασθε δη εν τούτῳ which involves a substantial semantic shift and the deletion of the personal pronoun. In 3.15 we encounter the rather inexplicable και αντεστησαν θεω for גם בחנו אלהים.

In Mal. 1.7, the Greek question Εν τινι ηλίσγησάμεν αυτους should be regarded as evidence of the translator's unwillingness to let the reading of his *Vorlage* stand. For the Hebrew גִּאלְנוֹהוּ quite clearly has Yahweh as the object of the verb. And the widespread versional support of the Hebrew plus the obvious greater difficulty of the MT tell against a reconstructed original גִּאלְנוֹהוּ (as recommended by BHS). In like manner the LXX reads with the MT against a supposed blasphemous original in the case of the altered text of verse 13 (Cf. the discussion of the *Tiqqune Sopherim* in Chapter 2).

## 5. Miscellaneous theological interests.

The translator reveals a number of other theological interests which seemed to function as hermeneutical lenses through which he read the ancient text. At times his shaping of the text seems to reflect his dissatisfaction with the sense of his *Vorlage*. At other times there is no evidence of his being at odds with the meaning of the Hebrew, rather he just seems to use certain passages as a platform from which he presents his views on the subject concerned. In certain contexts, the translator seems interested to expand the problem of sin. So for example, In Hag. 2.14, the Hebrew states that "everything which they offer there is

unclean" which the translator alters to state "and whoever draws near there, he will be defiled because of ..." Whereas the **וְאִשֶּׁר** might have represented a certain ambiguity, the rendering of the Hiphil **יִקְרִיבוּ** with the usually intransitive **εγγιση** clearly is tendentious and represents the translator's view on the deadly contagion of uncleanness. In a similar way, one finds an extremely complicated and subtle rewriting of Mal. 3.6-7 which results in the Greek text actually juxtaposing and by implication comparing the changelessness of Yahweh with the persistent sin of the people (**οὐκ ἀπεχέσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδικιῶν** **לֹא כִלִּיתֶם לַמִּימִי**). Although the Greek text departs from the meaning of the Hebrew completely, there is evidence that the whole reshaping of the passage derives quite directly from the translator's interest not to contradict his reading of 3.9 **τὸ ἔθνος συνετέλεσθη**. (On the translator's interest to accentuate the sinfulness of the people, compare the discussion of Mal. 1.1 and the references to Zech. 1 in f. n. #2). It is interesting to note that the translator is not content to accentuate the sinfulness of the people in general terms alone, but that he manages to interject his specific conjecture that certain women are probably very much behind the trouble referred to in Mal. 2. He makes this opinion known through his unparalleled feminine renderings of **בְּמַכְשָׁפִים** = **τὰς φαρμακούς** and **וּבְמִנְאִפִּים** = **τὰς μοιχαλίδας** in Mal. 3.6.

Although it is very difficult to determine precisely which Greek/Hebrew differences in Mal. 3.16 derive from the translator himself and which were in his Hebrew *Vorlage*, it does nevertheless seem likely that he had some part in the reshaping of the passage. And the Greek of the passage is completely recast by the statement **ταῦτα κατέλαλσαν οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον**. This statement puts the previous verse in the

mouths of the faithful Jews (perhaps sharp irony ?) and thereby obliterates an *innerjudische* distinction implicit in the MT. And although we have marshalled a few arguments in favor of the position that ταυτα derives from תאנא from which the MT's תנא is a corruption, thus removing this critical MT/LXX difference beyond the translator to his *Vorlage*, nevertheless there are numerous other differences in the passage which probably represent the input of the translator. Clearly the general septuagintal slant of the passage is supported by the very interesting ׀׀׀׀׀ / αλλοτριους, αλλογενεις renderings which do not likely derive from a different *Vorlage*. And there is a very similar passage in Zeph. 3.14-17 where it is quite clear that the translator is at pains to spiritualize and universalize the description of a coming restoration. The result once again is to obliterate an *innerjudische* distinction and to democratize the sinfulness of the people. Compare Zeph. 3.11 where instead of removing "those who proudly exalt themselves" תַּנְתִּיזַי , Yahweh removes "your arrogant acts of contempt" τα φουλισματα της υβρεως σου. See my analysis of the passage under the discussion of the θαρσειτε of Hag. 2.5.

Notwithstanding the translator's apparent interest to democratize the problem of sin, there is observed a contrary impulse to exempt the prophet Malachi from the sins of the people in a way which the Hebrew text does not support. So for example, in Mal. 1.9 the Greek text in addition to rendering tendentiously the verb as though it were in the Hithpael rather than the Qal stem also deletes the first person plural pronominal suffix. And once again, the general slant of the LXX is accentuated by later scribes in their introduction of a doublet which again emphasizes the second person-- ινα ελεση υμας S<sup>ca</sup> L' 407, 576, 613, 770, 233', Bo, Th., Tht. Furthermore, in Mal. 2.11 the Greek's τι οτι



εγκατελιπετε εκαστος τον αδελφον αυτου appears to be a similarly-intentioned alteration of the Hebrew מדוע נכגד איש באחי. It is perhaps the case that the translator is involved in a subtle idealization of the prophet much like the idealization which we earlier mentioned concerning Zerubbabel and Joshua.

It must also be mentioned that the translator regularly introduces slight changes into the text which he imagines make minor logical or conceptual improvements to the text. So for example, in Hag. 1 8 αναβητε επι το ορος και κοψατε ξυλα is surely a sharpening of the logic of עלו עץ והבאתם. Inasmuch as the reconstructed *Varlage* והבאתם is unlikely both in terms of Hebrew idiom and in terms of Greek renderings of that verb, it is much more likely that the translator is simply clarifying that before one could bring wood it would have to be cut.

In Hag. 2.22 one finds the rather insubstantial metonymical shift from the idea of "kingdoms" ממלכות to that of "kings" βασιλεων. This type of shift is of course minor rather than substantial and can go either direction. Cf. Zephaniah 3.8 ממלכות / βασιλεις.

In Mal. 2.5, the Greek και απο προσωπου ονοματος μου στελλεσθαι αυτον as a rendering of ומפני שמי נחת הוא probably represents the translator's interest to make concrete that which in the Hebrew is quite abstract. And this modification also nicely coheres with another idea in the text. For this standing aloof in reverential fear is a perfect contrast to the priests of Malachi's day who are brazenly coming before Yahweh with all sorts of defective offerings. In the textual commentary I have suggested very many similar instances where it is quite probable that the translator makes subtle literary and logical modifications of this nature to the text.



#### 6. The extensive use of tendentious palaeographical exegesis.

One of the most striking aspects of the translator's treatment of his text pertains not so much to the various ideas which he introduces into the text but rather to the method by which he introduces his modifications. The translator's dominant hermeneutical principle with respect to his *modus operandi* is that he regularly employs tendentious palaeographical exegesis.<sup>10</sup> The realization of this method of translation is critical for a proper assessment of the text. For it was surely the inattentiveness of many previous scholars to this translational technique which led to their making a fantastic number of unconvincing suggestions about the LXX's supposed "differing *Vorlage*." For many text critics, the origin of the difference between the MT and the LXX was known and decisively demonstrated if one could reconstruct a Hebrew text which would be quite naturally translated as the Greek of the passage, especially when the suggested *Vorlage* bore some measure of palaeographical or phonological resemblance to the Hebrew of the MT. For this resemblance served as a proof of how easily such a variant might have come about in the transmission of the ancient Hebrew texts. However, there is mounting evidence that paronomastic concerns were a common feature of ancient exegesis and translation technique. The methodological significance of this dawning awareness and growing consensus could scarcely be exaggerated.

#### Paronomasia in ancient translation and exegesis.

The Samaritan Targum has recently been described as reflecting both an almost "'slavish' devotion to the Hebrew text while yet betraying numerous "subtle midrashic interpretations beyond the apparently mechanical translations."<sup>11</sup> Abraham Tal offers several suggestive

illustrations of instances where earlier scholars might have suspected that the text had fallen into grotesque blunders when in fact the text was highly yet subtly midrashic in character. He states:

Thus, in Gen 41:2 **בִּאָחוּ** 'they feed in the reed grass', is translated by J as **ורעיניין בתלימו**. **אח** equals **תלים**, 'brother' ( *supra*) in Aramaic: apparently, the targum has misunderstood the vocable **אחו**, 'reed grass' and, ascribing it to **אח**, created a 'grotesque blunder', **תלימו**, which imitates the Hebrew model attaching a final **מ** to **תלים**. On closer examination, the echo of a midrash can be detected, as the one formulated in *Genesis Rabba* 99:4 (p. 1090-91) **בְּעוֹלָם בְּשַׁעֲהָ שְׁהַשְׁנִים יָפוֹת הַבְּרִיּוֹת נַעֲשִׂים אֲחִים אֵילֹוּ לְאֵילֹוּ . . . בִּאָחוּ** 'when years are prosperous, people fraternize . . . love and fraternity reside in the world'. Consequently, the final **מ** is not an imitation of the Hebrew original but the well-known termination of the Aramaic *nomina abstracta* transforming **תלים**, 'brother', into **תלימו**, according to the midrashic interpretation of **אחו**. This kind of 'concealed' midrash is quite frequent in the various manuscripts of the Samaritan Targum.<sup>12</sup>

Tal also lists numerous fascinating instances where phonetic or morphological changes led to peculiar interpretations.<sup>13</sup>

On the translation technique of the Jewish Aramaic targums, Philip Alexander offers some interesting discussion of "treatment of anthropomorphism," "actualisation," "doublets," "associative translation," "complementary translation" and "converse translation."<sup>14</sup> He also offers a detailed and fascinating discussion of the Targum's treatment of Canticles 5.16. He states:

At first sight the targum appears untrammelled. Closer analysis suggests that behind it lies a disciplined and exact exegesis of the biblical text. Each element in the original is taken as a symbol or cypher to be decoded and arranged in a coherent story, within the broad hermeneutical perspective that the text is an allegorical statement about God's relationship to Israel through Tora. Canticles 5:13 illustrates the method. 'Cheeks' (*hāyayim*) in the Hebrew is interpreted, on the basis of similarity of sound, as alluding to the 'two tablets' (*luhot*) of the Law'. But how can the tablets of the Law

be like 'a bed of spices'? The comparison must be between the orderly rows of plants in the herb-garden, and the lines of writing on the tablets. The meturgeman's interpretation of the next word seems to turn on a repointing: for the masoretic *migdāl* he reads *m<sup>h</sup>gaddāl*, 'producing'. *Merqāhīm* is then given a twofold sense: literally as 'spices', and allegorically as the 'subtleties of the Law'. Hence: 'The Law produces subtleties, just as a herb-garden produces spices'. God's 'lips' are taken naturally as referring to his spokesmen, the Sages, and the 'myrrh' which flows from the lips as the pronouncements of the Sages on matters of Law.<sup>15</sup>

Concerning the Old Latin translations, Benjamin Kedar mentions several fascinating interpretational modifications of the text, and cautions that the perception of these alterations will depend on an almost microscopic reading of the text. As he states,

Given the extreme literalism of the version under review, one must not expect any glaring instances of hermeneutics as are found e.g. in some of the Aramaic targums. One has to read between the line, so to speak, in order to perceive echoes of exegetical traditions; in other words, the minute details of lexical equivalents and idiomatic renderings in each single verse have to be scrutinized.<sup>16</sup>

Concerning the Vulgate, Kedar points out the intentionality of several of Jerome's "mistaken etymologies." He states,

What then shall we make of the alleged mistaken renderings and errors in Jerome's translation? To begin with, most of the so-called mistakes, if not all, commonly adduced are definitely not blunders but conscientiously chosen renderings in agreement with philological notions current in his times. Indeed, it is easy to find support for his renderings in Jewish versions and commentaries. As we shall return to this question later, suffice it to adduce an example or two.

As is well known, Jerome derived the verb *qrn* (Exod 34:29) not from *qeren* 'a ray', but from *qeren* 'horn', and thus aided in creating the image of a 'horned' Moses: his face was horned (*cornuta*). This, however, is not a haphazard rendering: Jerome could have copied the LXX ('glorified'), had he wanted it. Yet his way of translating is a replica of Aquila's etymologizing rendition and was meant as a glorification of Moses: horns are the insignia of might and majesty (6, 321; 4, 68). Jerome overlooking the homonym presents the usual

*costa* 'a rib' for *ṣela* (Job 18:12) instead of 'a fall, ruin' (calamity is ready for his ruin). Yet Jerome elsewhere knew how to translate the homonym correctly: *plaga* (Ps. 38:18).<sup>17</sup>

It seems that in general, textual scholars are now being more cautious in their assessments of textual diversity. It is now frequently judged to be precarious to decide that an unexpected or divergent reading is an unintentional error or reflects a differing *Varlage* until one has seriously considered and decided against the possibility that there is some sort of intentional alteration or word-play involved. A very similar cautious attitude can now be found among some of the scrolls specialists. So, for example, we encounter an article like that recently written by George J. Brooke, entitled "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?"<sup>18</sup> In this article Dr. Brooke argues very persuasively that a very considerable number of variants found in the Qumran commentaries are by design and do not reflect real textual variants. He agrees with Talmon that the general textual picture is such that there is "a blurring of the distinctions between higher and lower criticism." Brooke states,

Furthermore, as part of the dissolution of the boundaries between criticism, text critics must allow that to discern an example of homoioteleuton or letter-change or some other particular phenomenon which the handbooks usually label as scribal errors may be to miss the deliberate editing of a text in one tradition or another.<sup>19</sup>

Brooke has anticipated my conclusion. It is my contention that the numerous suggestions of old which explained the differences between the LXX and the MT of Haggai and Malachi in terms of a different *Varlage* blinded scholars to the family likeness of said differences. Imagining that the differences were individual and accidental corruptions at different stages in the transmission of the ancient Hebrew text, scholars

did not see that the differences coalesced into a pattern and that this pattern revealed the particular interests of the Greek translator. There has been a long-lived resistance to the idea that the believing community might have handled its sacred texts with such freedom. Some have imagined that such an approach to the text would necessarily imply a low estimate of the text's worth or authority. And yet, we have observed in the LXX of Haggai and Malachi a painstaking reworking of the text. There is nothing casual or flippant about the treatment whatsoever. The text is the product of a careful, indeed scholarly theological process. Certainly the translator revered his inherited text (whatever its precise delimitations?).<sup>20</sup> But to the ancient translator, the authoritative text could be none other than the inherited text as received and apprehended by the believing community. As Greer notes,

We tend to think of an original sense, understood historically, and to regard theological interpretation as a departure from the true meaning of the text. Nothing could be farther from the point of view of religious writers in late antiquity. Pagan, Jew, and Christian were united in assuming the general correlation of sacred texts with the beliefs and practices of religious communities. Scripture represented the authority for those beliefs and practices, but at the same time the religious convictions of the community unveiled the true meaning of Scripture. Far from supplying a new meaning, the transformations of sacred books disclosed their true significance.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Ziegler, "Zur Dodekapropheten -- LXX," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 38 (1962), p. 904.

<sup>2</sup>James Barr, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations, Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), p. 280. Barr states, "For--and this is my principal argument--there are different ways of being literal and of being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels."

<sup>3</sup>E. Tov and B. G. Wright, "Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," Textus 12 (1985), p. 181.

<sup>4</sup>Takamitsu Muraoka, pp. 24-5.

<sup>5</sup>Claude Cox, p. 79.

<sup>6</sup>So Emanuel Tov states, "There certainly was (and still is) a tendency, even among critical scholars, to depreciate the value of the LXX by ascribing most of its deviations to the translator's exegesis and techniques. This was partly influenced by religious and other prejudices, which rejected the possibility that the underlying text of the LXX sometimes differed from MT. The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3, ed. Ora Lipschitz and Alexander Rofé (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981), pp. 70-1.

<sup>7</sup>See especially S. P. Brock in "Translating the Old Testament," in It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF, ed. by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). On p. 92 he states:

By describing the translators as 'prophets' Philo was claiming that the Greek translation has an authority equal to that of the original: both original and translation are to be held in 'awe and reverence as sisters' (*ibid.*). On such a view (inherited by the early christian church) any observable differences between the Greek and the Hebrew were no longer a matter of concern, requiring correction on the ground



that the translators had failed in what later generations saw as their proper role as merely *interpretes*, word for word translators: since they were in fact 'prophets', rather than *interpretes*, the translators could be regarded as having been in a position to act as authoritative expositors as well. In passing, it is worth noticing that this attitude to the LXX on the part of diaspora Judaism takes on a new significance (*mutatis mutandis*) in the context of modern discussion of 'scriptural authenticity', as opposed to 'literary authenticity', as a criterion for selecting a base text for modern translations (Barthélemy, 1982, Introduction, esp. pp. \*111-12).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>9</sup>An interesting and roughly contemporaneous parallel to this type of alteration is found in the "Potter's Oracle." Fishbane states, In addition to these instances of *vaticinia ex eventu*, the reinterpretation and 'updating' of old predictions is also very much in evidence in ancient Near Eastern sources. Perhaps the most intriguing instance is the so-called 'Potter's Oracle', whose text-tradition and successive re-workings have been studied by L. Koenen, and appear to derive from the prototype known from Neferti's prophecy noted earlier. The original oracle was supposedly made by a potter in the reign of Pharaoh Amenhotep in response to the smashing of his pottery by zealots who considered his actions on the island of Helios to be sacrilegious. The potter predicted the destruction of Egypt and its eventual restoration under a saviour-king. According to Koenen, this event most likely reflects the revolt of Harsiesis (c. 130 BCE) and predicts the restoration of native rule from the Greeks.

But this predicted overthrow of Greek hegemony did not occur, with the result that significant interpolations were inserted into the old oracle, as is evidenced by the version of it preserved in P. Oxyrhynchus 2332 (third century CE). The original prediction assigned a reign of fifty-seven years to the saviour-king; a later gloss reversed this, and added it to an older prediction by 'Bokcharis the Lamb' of the period of evil to be brought on by the advent of the Greeks (P. Oxyrhynchus 2332, lines 31-4). If one subtracts this time-period from the end originally predicted by Bokcharis, one comes to 137 CE for the end of the period of evil. This period would have been just prior to the onset of the next Sothis cycle (139 CE); and so, argued Koenen, the old prophecy was transformed into an



apocalypse which would have its onset at the beginning of a new world-cycle. [Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, (1985), pp. 475-6.]

However, it must be stressed that the Greek of the Minor Prophets never ties the time of fulfillment to any specific period. One looks in vain for any evidence that the translator regarded his own day as the time of fulfillment.

<sup>10</sup> Tov's discussion of this issue, "Excursus 2: Tendentious Palaeographical Exegesis" (pp. 155-58 in Text-Critical Use) is altogether one-sided. It is surely misleading to focus only on difficulties involved in viewing the text this way, and to offer no suggestive illustrations of its clear existence. The serious deficiency of the treatment is nicely remedied in his discussion of "Pseudo-variants" on pp. 228-240. Tov defines what he means by "pseudo-variants" on p. 228. He states, "The preceding sections describe deviations in the LXX which reflect either variants or non-variants. The deviations to be discussed here reflect a peculiar combination of a variant and a non-variant. They are variants insofar as the deviations can easily be retroverted into Hebrew on the basis of Greek-Hebrew equivalents occurring elsewhere. They are non-variants insofar as the retroverted readings presumably were not found in the translator's *Vorlage*, but existed only in his *mind*."

<sup>11</sup> So Abraham Tal in "The Samaritan Targum" in Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling ed. Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* Section 2, Vol. 1. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 200-202.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 201.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 210-13.

<sup>14</sup> In "Jewish Aramaic Translations" in Mikra See esp. pp. 226-29.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 236.

<sup>16</sup> In "The Latin Translations" in Mikra, p. 308.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 317-18.

<sup>18</sup> In Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee, ed. by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring

(Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 85-100.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>20</sup> It remains to be proved just how much of the Hebrew text the translator inherited. Was it a consonantal skeleton, or was it fleshed out with a learned full-blown system of vocalization? The distinction between the inherited text and the apprehended text has a concrete and graphic illustration in the ancient Hebrew OT if there was no accompanying system of vocalization. Tov has a very good discussion of the question and the scholarly debate. See esp. Text-Critical Use pp. 159-174. Concerning the translator's acquaintance with an inherited tradition of reading the text, he states,

They certainly were not acquainted with all the details of vocalization, but, apart from some significant exceptions to be discussed below, they recognized its main features. (p. 162)

I have not in this study made any assumptions concerning either the extent of an inherited system of vocalization or if there were one the extent of its agreement with the MT. I do not think there is enough evidence to warrant speculation in these matters at the present time. I have pointed out one detail of vocalization in Zech. 8 (pp. 63-5) which might be behind an abrupt (and contextually inappropriate shift change) and one possible illustration of mistranslation based on the MT's vocalization in Zeph. 2.14 (p. 66). Instances of mistranslation based on the vocalization are important as evidence that the translator felt responsible to deal with more than a consonantal skeleton. But of course it cannot simply be assumed nor is it at all likely that any vocalization system inherited was identical with the MT. But it is often imagined that the amount of apparent deviation from the MT with respect to vocalization is so much greater than the amount of deviation at the level of the consonants that it is fairly sure that the text either had no vocalization system or had one very different from the MT. But it is perhaps fair to raise the question, if a translation has been shown to betray extensive paronomastic liberty, would it not be likely that such liberty would be operative even more extensively in the known but unwritten vocalization system?

<sup>21</sup>In James L. Kugel and Rowan A Greer's Early Biblical Interpretation, Library of Early Christianity (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), p. 126.

## Works Consulted

Ackroyd, Peter. Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought in the Sixth Century B.C. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.

Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Allen, Leslie C. The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur 5th ed., 2nd ed. of the English revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Baldwin, Joyce G. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary. The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972.

Barber, E. A. ed., with the assistance of P. Maas, M. Scheller and M. L. West. Greek-English Lexicon: A Supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Barr, James. Review of The Text of the Septuagint: its Corruptions and their Emendation, by Peter Walters, ed. by D. W. Gooding. In Vetus Testamentum 25, Fasc. 2 (1973): 247-254.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, pp. 279-325.

Barnes, W. E. Haggai and Zechariah. Cambridge Bible for Schools and

Colleges. Cambridge: 1917.

Bauer, Walter. Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur 6th ed. revised by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, in collaboration especially with Viktor Reichmann, at the Münster Institute for New Testament Textual Research. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1988.

Benoit, P., J. T. Milik and R. De Vaux, ed. Les Grottes de Murabba'ât. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Beuken, W. A. M. Haggai--Sacharja 1-8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1967.

Brenton, Lancelot C. L. The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1851.

Brock, S. P. "Translating the Old Testament." In It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF. ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 87-98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Brooke, George J. "The Biblical Texts in Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" In Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis. Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee. ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, 85-100. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1987.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Brownlee, William H. The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran. Philadelphia: SBL, 1959.

Budde, Karl. "Zum Text der drei letzten Kleinen Propheten." ZAW 1906: 1-28.

Bullinger, E. W. Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated, 1898, reprinted 1968 by Baker Book House Company.

Bulmerincq, A. von. Der Prophet Maleachi. Vol. 1. Dorpat: Matthiesseus, 1926. Vol. 2. Tartu: 1932.

- Caird, G. B. "Homoeophony in the Septuagint" in Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies. ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976: 74-88.
- Cathcart, Kevin J. and Robert P. Gordon. The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes. The Aramaic Bible Vol. 14. ed. Kevin J. Cathcart, Michael Maher and Martin McNamara. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989.
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha 1-2. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1983, 1985.
- Chary, Théophane. Aggée--Zacharie--Malachie. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969.
- Childs, Brevard. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Cohen, A., ed. The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary. London: The Soncino Press, 1957.
- Cox, Claude. "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job," in the VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. ed. Claude Cox, 79-89. Jerusalem (1986). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Cross, Frank Moore Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, rev. ed., 1961; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Davidson, A. B. Hebrew Syntax, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- Davidson, B. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, 1956.
- Deist, F. E. Towards the Text of the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Translated by W. K. Winckler. Pretoria: N. G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1981.
- Diingermann, Friedrich. "Massora-Septuaginta der kleinen Propheten: Eine textkritische Studie." Inaugural diss., Würzburg, 1948.
- Driver, S. R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. 3rd. ed.,

revised and improved. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1892.

Fishbane, Michael. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fohrer, Georg. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by David Green. London: SPCK, 1970.

Frensdorff, S. The Massorah Magna, Part One: Massoretic Dictionary or The Massorah in Alphabetical Order. Leipzig, 1876; reprint with Prolegomenon by Gérard E. Weil, New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.

Gelston, A. The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Ginsburg, C.D. The Massorah Compiled from Manuscripts, Alphabetically and Lexically Arranged. London, 1881-1905.

Glazier-McDonald, Beth. Malachi: The Divine Messenger. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 98. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Gordis, Robert. The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of Kethib-Qere. Augmented edition with a Prolegomenon by Robert Gordis. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," Biblica 48 (1967): 243-90.

Grossouw, W. The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets: A Contribution to the Study of the Septuagint. Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica 3. Rome: 1938.

Gulkowitsch, Lazar. Die Bildung von Abstraktbegriffen in der hebräischen Sprachgeschichte. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1931.

Harrison, R. K. Introduction to the Old Testament with a Comprehensive Review of Old Testament Studies and a Special Supplement on the Apocrypha. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.

Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. Translated by John



Bowden. (1974) First one-volume edition, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Holladay, William L. The Root Sûbh in the Old Testament with Particular Reference to its Usages in Covenantal Contexts. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Hoonacker, A. van. Les douze petits prophetes. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1908.

Horgan, Maurya P. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly: Monograph Series, 8. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. Israel: n. p., 1903.

Kaminka, Armand. Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher. Frankfurt A. M.: J. Kauffman Verlag, 1928.

Kautzsch, E. ed. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 2nd ed. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. Commentary on the Old Testament: Vol. 10, Minor Prophets. Translated by James Martin. (n.d.) reprint, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.

Kittel, Rudolph. Biblia Hebraica. Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906.

Klein, R. W. Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran. Guides to Biblical Scholarship: Old Testament Series, ed. Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Kugel, James L. and Rowan A. Greer. Early Biblical Interpretation. Library of Early Christianity, ed. Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.

Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. A History of the Hebrew Language, ed. by Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984.

Lambdin, Thomas O. Introduction to Biblical Hebrew. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1971.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: The Clarendon



Press, 1961.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and others, 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Mays, James L., ed. Harper's Bible Commentary. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1988.

Mayser, Edwin. Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften Bd. II:2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1934.

Meyers, Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers. Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1987.

Mitchell, Hinckley G., John Merlin Powis Smith and Julius A. Bewer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Moore, G. F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim 1-3. Cambridge, 1927-1930; reprint New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol I: Prolegomena. 3rd ed. with corrections and additions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908. Vol. 3: Nigel Turner, Syntax. Edinburgh, 1963.

Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources. 1930; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

Mulder, Jan and Harry Sysling ed. Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* Section 2, Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute 9 (1983): 24-64.

- Ogden, Graham S. and Richard R. Deutsch. A Promise of Hope--A Call to Obedience: A Commentary on the Books of Joel and Malachi. International Theological Commentary, ed. Fredrick Carlson Holmgren and George A. F. Knight. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987.
- Perowne, T. T. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1901.
- Petersen, David L. Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1984.
- Pusey, Edvardus Philippus, ed. Cyriilli: Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas. Vol. II. Oxonii: 1868, reprint Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. Haggai; Sacharja 1-8; Sacharja 9-14; Maleachai, Kommentar zum alten Testament, band XIII.4. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zu Malachi 2: 10-16." ZAW 93 (1981): 85-90.
- Sanders, James A. "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method," Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979): 5-29.
- Schreiner, S. "Mischehen-Ehebruch-Ehehscheidung: Betrachtungen zu Malachi 2: 10-16." ZAW 91 (1979): 207-28.
- Smith, George Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets Commonly Called the Minor. Vol. 2. The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898.
- Smith, Ralph L. Micah-Malachi. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 32. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. Introduction to the Old Testament: From its origins to the closing of the Alexandrian canon, 3rd ed. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989.
- Sollamo, Raija. Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

- Stekhoven, J. Z. Schuurmans. De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1887.
- Stuhlmuehler, Carroll. Rebuilding with Hope: A Commentary on the Books of Haggai and Zechariah. International Theological Commentary, ed. Fredrick Carlson Holmgren and George A. F. Knight. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988.
- Thackeray, H. St. John. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. I: "Introduction, Orthography and Accidence." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- The Jewish Publication Society, Tanakh--The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985.
- Thomas, D. Winton. "The Book of Haggai," in The Interpreter's Bible in Twelve Volumes. Vol. 6. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 1035-49.
- Tov, Emanuel. The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research. Jerusalem Biblical Studies Vol. 3, ed. Ora Lipschitz and Alexander Rofé. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judeean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," Journal of Jewish Studies 39, no. 1 (Spring, 1988): 5-37.
- Tov, E. and B. G. Wright. "Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," Textus 12 (1985): 149-187.
- Vegas Montaner, Luis. "Aportación al aparato crítico de la Biblia Hebraica: relación completa de variantes de los manuscritos del Mar Muerto respecto al textus receptus de Profetas Menores" In Simposio Bíblico Español (Salamanca, 1982). ed. N. Fernandez Marcos, J. Treballe Barrera and J. Fernandez Vallina, 149-181. Madrid: Universidad Complutense.
- Verhoef, Pieter A. The Books of Haggai and Malachi. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987.
- Vollers, K. A. Das Dodekapropheton Der Alexandriner: Erste Hälfte: Naúm,

Ambakûm, Sophonias, Angaios, Zacharias, Malachias. Berlin: Mayer and Mueller, 1880.

Von Rad, Gerhard. Old Testament Theology: Volume Two: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965.

Weber, Robertus, ed. Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

Wellhausen, J. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, Fünftes Heft: Die Kleinen Propheten Übersetzt, Mit Noten. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892.

Wevers, J. W. "Translation and Canonicity: A Study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus." In SCRIPTA SIGNA VOCIS: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East, presented to J. H. Hoppers by his pupils, colleagues and friends. ed. H. L. J. Vanstiphout, K. Jongeling, F. Leemhuis and G. J. Reinink, 295-303. Groningen, The Netherlands: Egbert Forsten, 1986.

Wiles, Maurice. The Christian Fathers, 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1977.

Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Wright, Benjamin G. No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text. Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 26. Claude E. Cox, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Wolff, Hans Walter. Haggai: A Commentary. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.

Würthwein, Ernst. The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979.

Yeivin, Israel. Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah. Translated and edited by E. J. Revell. Masoretic Studies 5. n.p.: Scholars Press, 1980.

Ziegler, Joseph. Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta. Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der

Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Vol. 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971:

"Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch." 29-42 = Beilage zum Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Staatl. Akademie zu Braunschweig/Ostpr. 1934/35, 1-16.

"Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheton." 71-138 = Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Philolog.-Hist. Klasse 1943, 345-412.

"Der griechische Dodekapropheton-Text der Complutenser Polyglotte." 229-242 = Bib 25 (1944), 297-310.

"Studien zur Verwertung der Septuaginta im Zwölfprophetenbuch." 243-267 = ZAW 60 (1944), 107-131.

"Beiträge zur koptischen Dodekapropheton-Überetzung." 268-305 = Bib 25 (1944), 105-142.

"Der Text der Aldina im Dodekapropheton." 306-320 = Bib 26 (1945), 37-51.

"Konjekturen oder überlieferte Lesarten? Zu Hab 2,5 κατοινωμένος / κατοιομένος." 340-344 = Bib 33 (1952), 366-370.

"Zur Dodekapropheton -- LXX." 587-589 = Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 38 (1962), 904-906.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. Duodecim prophetae. 3rd ed. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Vol 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984.

Zuntz, Günther. The Text of the Epistles. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1946. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of the Epistles" in G. Zuntz, Opuscula Selecta. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972: 252-268.